THE PURITAN VISITATION OF JESUS COLLEGE, OXFORD. AND DR. MICHAEL ROBERTS

1648 - 1657

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

https://archive.org/details/puritanvisitatio0000thom

Cymmrodorion Society's Publications.

THE PURITAN VISITATION OF JESUS COLLEGE OXFORD AND THE PRINCIPALSHIP OF DR. MICHAEL ROBERTS (1648-1657)

By

THOMAS RICHARDS, M.A., Maesteg.

From the "Transactions" of the Honourable Society of Cymmrodorion, Session 1922-23.

LONDON:
THE HONOURABLE SOCIETY OF CYMMRODORION,
NEW STONE BUILDINGS, 64, CHANCERY LANE.

1924.

Accession R9/2962c
Class No. 942.9.
Date W
Stamped Holborn Libraries.

THE PURITAN VISITATION OF JESUS COLLEGE, OXFORD, AND THE PRINCIPALSHIP OF DR. MICHAEL ROBERTS (1648—1657).[1]

By THOMAS RICHARDS, M.A., Secondary School, Maesteg.

CONTENTS.

(i) Conspectus. (ii) The Jesus Visitation. (iii) Hypocrite and Adventurer. (iv) The October Elections. (v) "A High Poynt of Necessitie". (vi) The Triumphs of Jenkin Lloyd. (vii) Desperate Remedies (*Note:* "Feb. 2, 1656"). (viii) "De Amovendo Principale". (ix) Quasi-Puritanism (*Note:* Henry Maurice). (x) Dr. Michael Roberts v. Sir Leoline Jenkins and Others. *Appendices: (a)* The Will of Dr. Michael Roberts (4 April, 1678). *(b)* An Inventory of his goods and chattels (2 June, 1679). *(c)* A Letter among the Panton Papers (O. III. 16).

The various sources are denoted at the foot of each page. In the case of those frequently cited whose official titles are inordinately long, the following abbreviations have been found convenient:—

Burrows: *Register*. The Register of the Visitors of the University of Oxford (1647-1658), edited by Montagu Burrows (for the Camden Society, 1881).

---

[1] Read (in part) before the Honourable Society of Cymmrodorion at King's College in the Strand, on Friday, the 16th of February, 1923. Chairman: The Rev. Dr. Maurice Jones, M.A., Principal of St. David's College, Lampeter.

Calamy : *Account.* An Account of the Ministers, Lecturers, Masters and Fellows of Colleges and Schoolmasters, who were Ejected or Silenc'd after the Restoration in 1660. By, or before, the Act for Uniformity. By Edmund Calamy, D.D. (1713).

Clark's Yearly Lists. Yearly Lists of Members of Jesus College, Oxford, compiled from the College Buttery Books by Andrew Clark (1912). This MS. is at Jesus College.

H.P.M. A History of the Puritan Movement in Wales (1639-1653), by the author of this paper (1920).

Liber Matric. PP. Book of Matriculations (Oxford) marked PP, with entries ranging from 1615 to 1647 (at the University Archives).

Liber Matric. W. Book of Matriculations (Oxford) marked W, with entries ranging from 1648-1649 to 1662 (at the Archives). This MS. was lost for some time after the Restoration, but discovered by Anthony Wood in 1686.

Life and Times. The Life and Times of Anthony Wood, antiquary of Oxford (1632-1695), described by Himself and Collected from his Diaries and other Papers by Andrew Clark, M.A. Four volumes (1891-1895).

Reg. Congregn. QA. Register of Congregation marked QA (11 Oct., 1647—27 July, 1659). At the Archives.

Reg. Convocn. T. Register of Convocation marked T (23 October, 1647—6 September, 1659). At the Archives.

Walker : *Sufferings.* An Attempt towards recovering an Account of the Numbers and Sufferings of the Clergy of the Church of England, Heads of Colleges, Fellows, Scholars, etc., who were Sequester'd, Harrass'd, etc., in the late times of the Grand Rebellion. By John Walker, M.A., Rector of St. Mary's the More in Exeter (1714).

Wynne MSS. "Very important additions were made at the close of the last century by the bequest of Luttrell Wynne, D.C.L., formerly fellow of All Souls, of more than one hundred volumes of Parliamentary Journals, State and other papers, the collections of Narcissus Luttrell, esq., and Owen Wynne, D.C.L., Secretary to Sir Leoline Jenkins, whilst Ambassador at the Hague and Cologne, and Secretary of State, in the reign of Charles the Second". (H. O. Coxe : *Catalogue of Manuscripts in the Library of All Souls' College* (1842) *Preface*, p. iv).

(i) Conspectus.

Always excepting English Pembroke and the Wrexham district, Wales stood steadfast behind the King in the Civil Wars ; with the exception of two or three Puritan Halls, Oxford opinion was almost unanimous on the same side ; there could not be much doubt, therefore, of the attitude of Welshmen resident in that University. Was

it not Humphrey Lloyd, Fellow of Oriel and afterwards Bishop of Bangor for many years, who said in 1642 that if he were able he had rather lend the King a thousand pounds than one penny to the Parliament?[1] And it is well to say outright that Jesus, in proportion to its numbers and its wealth, was the most loyal of all the Oxford colleges : it supplied officers to the King's army, gladly suffered itself to be taxed for the upkeep of the city fortifications, presented College plate to the King weighing 86lbs. 11ozs. 5dwts., and saw most of the rich furniture of the Principal's " Lodgings " taken away by the strangers, whether Cavalier or Puritan, " who lodged in and had the use of it for Divers Yeares."[2] An old student of the College, Rowland Vaughan of Caergai in Merioneth, had his house burnt over his head ;[3] a sometime Fellow, Dr. Hugh Lloyd of St. Andrew's in Glamorgan, was made prisoner by Horton at the battle of St. Fagans ;[4] and his lot in that battle was not dissimilar to that of many of " the best gentry in South Wales " who had but a few years before been members of the Welsh foundation.[5] Even the pugnacious Fellow of Oriel just mentioned had matriculated at Jesus.[6] A word of caution must be inserted that all Jesus men were not of this pattern : there was Dr. John Ellis, also sometime Fellow, Puritan rector of Dolgelley since 1646 ;[7] Henry Walter, an old Fellow and B.C.L., who had in that same year set out on a romantic preaching crusade to Monmouth and the west in company with Cradock and Symonds ;[8] Vavasor Powell, a much greater personality than either, who is said by John Aubrey on excellent hearsay evidence to have been at Jesus for some time[9] and whom Anthony Wood, to his own disgust, had to include among the Oxonians of the

[1] *Life and Times*, i, 62. According to Walker (*Sufferings*, ii, 84), he was born at Trawsfynydd.

[2] E. G. Hardy : *Jesus College*, pp. 103, 106, 114.

[3] *Dict. Nat. Biog.*, lviii, 178 ; J. R. Phillips, *Hist. Civil War in Wales*, i, 342.

[4] *H.P.M.*, p. 33 (and n. 2).

[5] *Chirk Castle Accounts* (ed. W. M. Myddelton, 1908), p. 27, n. 83 (letter of Jonathan Edwards to Watkin Kyffin in 1637).

[6] E. G. Hardy : *Jesus College*, p. 99.

[7] *H.P.M.*, p. 64.

[8] *Ib.*, p. 70.

[9] *Brief Lives*, ii, 171 (as edited by Andrew Clark in 1898). A reservation should be made that Vavasor's name does not appear in *Liber Matric PP* (entries ranging from 1615 to 1647).

"Athenae";[1] finally, Jenkin Jones of Tymawr by Llanthetty and "clero-mastix" under the three years' Propagation Act for Wales.[2] But these, after all, were not of the real Jesus tradition and outlook as exemplified in the person of its greatest Principal, Francis Mansell of Carmarthenshire, a man who had the unique distinction of holding the office at three different periods. Not only was Dr. Mansell an excellent Principal and a very worthy representative of contemporary Oxford culture;[3] he was also an inexpugnable Royalist, as witness his loan of £1,000 ready money to the King's forces in South Wales and his general ardour in keeping up the hearts of the gentlemen of those parts in the King's cause. And if these facts be not sufficient to attest his loyalty, let it be added that his companions in exile at the outbreak of war were no less than Accepted Frewen, then Archbishop of York, and Gilbert Sheldon, at that time Warden of All Souls, but in the days of the Restoration to become Archbishop of Canterbury after the death of William Juxon. It should be explained that these divines accompanied Mansell during his first exile in 1642, and that the aforesaid £1,000 was the ready money left by his brother Anthony at his death in 1643 at the first battle of Newbury, which event caused the Principal to hurry to Glamorgan to put the affairs of the deceased in order. This second exile lasted well into the year 1646.[4]

The moving cause of his return to Oxford was the dreaded parliamentary "visitation" of the University. On 24 June, 1646, the Oxford garrison surrendered on terms to General Fairfax; and though it was perfectly consonant with that general's character (and with Cromwell's too, for that matter) that his first order should be to

[1] *H.P.M.*, p. 105 and n. 7. To the end the antiquary was in some doubt: "if not of Jes. Coll., then bring him into Jes. Coll.," *i.e.*, in the "Athenae Oxonienses" (*Life and Times*, i, foot-notes on pp. 292-293, quoting Wood MS. 300).

[2] Alex. Griffith: *Strena Vavasoriensis*, p. 12.

[3] In *Cymmrodor*, xxxi, 236 (art. *The Chapter of Llandaff Cathedral*, 1561-1668) the learned Lord Bishop of Monmouth refers to Mansell as Treasurer from 1631 to 1665, a D.D., and a distinguished person, but he makes no reference to his Principalship of Jesus College.

[4] E. G. Hardy: Jesus College, pp. 102, 105-106. The exact date when the two Doctors visited Llantrithyd is a question of some difficulty (cp. John Aubrey: *Brief Lives*, ii, 8 with *Life and Times*, iii, 162, esp. n. 7).

set a guard of soldiers to preserve the Bodleian Library,[1] it was also incumbent upon him as custodian of the Parliament's ideals concerning the future of Oxford—a city which had been for a considerable time the headquarters of the Royalist cause and besides the chief centre of a new school of religious thought which had been one of the prime causes of the war[2]—to make it clear that the submission of the King's soldiers would eventually entail a very serious change of fortune to the King's supporters among the inmates of the University. The Treaty of Surrender guaranteed that the fabric of the colleges should be preserved from spoil and that there should be an indemnity from sequestration for "anything relating to this present war"; the University was secured in its ancient form of government so long as the latter was subordinate to the immediate power and authority of Parliament; no doubt at all was left but that "a reformation was there intended" by the victorious party.[3] It is not the province of this paper to go into full details of the developments that followed: the attempt made by Parliament to storm the intellectual ramparts by sending down six Presbyterian preachers (most of them old Oxford men), an attempt made ridiculous by the flank attack of the irrepressible Welsh Puritan Erbery, who was then acting as chaplain to the new soldiery of the garrison;[4] the ordinance of 1 May, 1647, which outlined the duties of the Visitors, and supplied their names;[5] the publication of the "Judgement of the University," a masterly document drawn up by Sanderson the casuist and Zouch the jurist in which the objections of Convocation to the projected reform were set out with forceful moderation;[6] the various factors that prevented the Visitors taking up their work with vigour and effect; and the additional ordinance passed by Parliament to make easier the thorny path of the new commissioners.[7] The Lords and Commons ap-

[1] John Aubrey: *Brief Lives*, i. 250-251.

[2] G. B. Tatham: *Puritans in Power*, p. 162.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 163.

[4] *Ibid.*, pp. 164-168. Erbery had graduated B.A. from Brasenose 24 years before (Heberden: *Bras. Coll. Reg.* i, p. 139).

[5] L. L. Shadwell: *Enactments in Parlt. . . . Oxford and Cambridge*, iv, App. II, 270 *et seq.*; Firth and Rait: *Acts and Ordinances*, i, 925-927.

[6] Burrows: *Register*, Introd. III, lxiii-lxiv. Its framers were the Regius Professors of Divinity and Civil Law respectively.

[7] Firth and Rait: *Acts and Ordinances*, i, 1001-1002.

pointed a committee for the regulation of the University to sit in London whose work varied from exhorting the Visitors to proceed with expedition at Oxford to acting as a court of appeal to deliver judgment on ambiguous answers and resolve disputed interpretations ;[1] the Visitors in turn (September, 1647) chose men in each college—"delegates" they were called—to report on the attitude of the members (this work was entrusted at Jesus to Constantine Adams, Vice-Principal and Fellow of eight years' standing[2]). The apparatus of attack was completed by two somewhat diverse personalities : the profane half-Puritan Earl of Pembroke who came as Chancellor to inaugurate the new reforms and Lieut.-Colonel Thomas Kelsey, alleged to be once a maker of buttons[3] but now in command of the Parliament's garrison at Oxford, ready to complement moral suasion with physical force. It will be found that the five-handed engine of Committee, Visitors, delegates, Chancellor and soldier proved much more potent than the declamations of the six preachers.

Early in May, 1648, batches from the various colleges, beginning with Christ Church[4] and extending from the senior Fellows to the lowest servants, were standing before the Visitors at Merton College to give answer to the apparently simple question—"Do you submit to the authority of Parliament in this Visitation"—but really so subtle that the replies to it boxed the whole compass of subterfuge and evasion ; however, when the Visitors reported these negative answers to the London Committee, the latter coolly classified them into seven groups, and quite as coolly declared that not one group amounted to the precise submission required by the Parliament.[5] Anthony Wood, the great Oxford antiquary and under-

[1] Burrows: *Register*, Introd., lxii. In reality this Committee had been in existence since July, 1646; but its powers were enlarged in the following year (Dr. W. A. Shaw: *Hist. Eng. Church*, ii, 217 (n. 1)).

[2] Burrows: *Register*, pp. 3-4; Hardy: *Jesus College*, App. iii, p. 239.

[3] Walker: *Sufferings*, i, 126, 142. He was also said to have been a 'Pedling Broker'.

[4] Among the earliest answers—both unsatisfactory and both leading to expulsion—were those of John Dolben, descendant of the Dolbens of Segrwyd in Denbigh, and of John Edwards of Stansty, near Wrexham, whose family had intermarried with John Jones, the 'regicide' of Maesygarnedd (Burrows: *Register* pp. 30, 32, 33, 69).

[5] Burrows: *Register*, pp. 88-89 (decisions dated 15 May, 1648).

graduate of Merton at this particular juncture, sheds considerable light on the inner proceedings of the visiting panel and on the methods by which influence and elasticity of conscience managed in many cases to escape the supreme penalty. He says the members of Colleges were called in one by one and the answer to the fatal question had to be written down on a paper lying on the table. Anthony's own answer was that he did not understand the business, a lack of understanding which could only mean expulsion; in his case that was prevented by the interest his mother and brother Edward were able to make with the Warden of Merton, who happened to sit in the chair of the Visitors at the time. "He was conniv'd at and kept in his place, otherwise he had infallibly gon to pot" is the antiquary's description of the plight he found himself in.[1] Then there is the case of the time-serving pot-poet of Christ Church named Robert Whitehall who, notwithstanding his declamation before the Visitors,

> "My name's Whitehall, God bless the poet,
> If I submit, the King shall know it",[2]

and his consequent ejection, became a Fellow of Merton by cringing to the London Committee (this pseudo-Puritan, however, so persevered with his habits of hard drinking that he became "loyned with sack and faced with claret").[3] And these two instances are but a prelude to other anomalies even more glaring: how Henry Savage, though expelled from Balliol by the Visitors, lived to become Master of the same society, that also by the grace of the Visitors;[4] the obverse fortune of Richard Hill, a Fellow of Brasenose, whose submission did not save him from being expelled;[5] the unexplained mystery of Sheldon losing the Wardenship of All Souls, but found celebrating the rites of baptism and marriage in the parish of Ickford from 1648 to 1650;[6] the great forbearance shown to Roger

[1] *Life and Times*, i, 144.

[2] This 'supposed answer' is very different from the prosaic words recorded of him in the actual *Register* (Burrows, see those of Christ Church, pp. 30-34).

[3] For the whole story, examine *Life and Times*, i, 144; Brodrick: *Memorials of Merton*, p. 292.

[4] cp. Burrows: *Register*, p. 164 with Dr. W. A. Shaw; *Hist. Eng. Church* (1640-1660), App. II, 575.

[5] Burrows: *Register*, pp. 68, 199.

[6] Vernon Staley: *Life of Gilbert Sheldon*, pp. 15-16, 17-18, 55-56.

Brent of Merton, presumably because he was a close relative of the Puritan Warden, who had himself been once Vicar-General under Laud ;[1] the time taken to deprive Dr. Oliver Lloyd of Montgomery (incidentally a great benefactor of Jesus[2]) of his Fellowship at All Souls, a man who in the earliest days of the war had given active support to the King,[3] who for three years managed to dodge the importunities of the Visitors by the flimsiest of excuses, one being that his debts in Oxford made it impossible for him to come up "till he had taken some order for them."[4] And as to Humphrey Lloyd, Fellow of Oriel, reported for non-appearance in July, 1648,[5] were the Visitors aware that he was the same Humphrey Lloyd as was presented by the Puritan Lords to the living of Ruabon in June, 1647, more than a year before?[6] And did the Puritan Lords in turn know that he was the same gentleman who had given such an intransigent answer in 1642 anent his love for the King as to be immured in the "Starre" and let out on a bail of £200?[7] To come to other Welshmen with even more familiar names than the two Lloyds, Samuel Jones of Merton (famous in later years as Jones of Llangynwyd and Brynllywarch) declared before the Visitors he would submit "as farre forth as you have power from the Kinge," and was down for certain expulsion ;[8] Philip Henry of Christ Church, famous father of a famous son, wrote down the words, "I doe willingely submitt to any thinge that I may with a saffe conscience," and knew that there was no mercy for such an answer from either the Visitors or the London Committee.[9] As a matter of fact, not one of the two was expelled. Jones within a few months found a new home at Jesus owing (no doubt) to the powerful intercession of his patron the Parliamentarian general Sir Thomas Myddelton of Chirk, whose steward was paying him an exhibition instalment

[1] Burrows : *Register*, pp. 130, 262, 321—322 ; R. G. Usher : *Rise and Fall of the High Commission*, App. ii, 346.
[2] E. G. Hardy : *Jesus College*, p. 74.
[3] *H.P.M.*, p. 32 (and n. 2).
[4] Burrows : *Register*, p. 289.
[5] Burrows, *Register*, p. 164.
[6] *H.P.M.*, p. 64. Lloyd, however, was not astute enough to deceive the Commissioners for the Propagation ; on 16 July, 1650, he was unceremoniously bundled out of the living (*ibid.*, p. 117).
[7] *Life and Times*, i, 62 (and n. 4).
[8] Burrows : *Register*, p. 82 (12 May, 1648).
[9] *Ibid.*, p. 72 (10 May, 1648).

of £1 5s. 0d. on the very day that the beneficiary was using the perilous name of the King before the Visitors;[1] Philip Henry had one of his many "seasonable mercies" by falling back on his godfather, the same Philip Herbert, fourth Earl of Pembroke, who happened fortunately to be Chancellor of the University at this time.[2] From these very inauspicious beginnings developed two of the weightiest names in the annals of Welsh Nonconformity. At a later stage of this work it will be found that a certain non-submitter of Wadham, by being nephew to a Justice of the Common Pleas who happened also to be a member of the first Visiting body (albeit an otiose member who never attended), was able in good time to be elected Scholar of Jesus and afterwards Fellow.[3] John Evans of Balliol, son to a stout Anglican rector of Penegoes, gave a flat refusal without reservations.[4] He was expelled, and five months later received priest's orders (in secret, of course) from ex-Bishop Mainwaring of St. David's.[5] Will it be believed that very soon after that Evans was a full-pledged Puritan schoolmaster and preacher, stood staunch at the Restoration, underwent much suffering and persecution, and closed the door on all compromise by marrying the widow of Vavasor Powell? In 1648, however, he could not count upon the support of either generals or chancellors or judges, and evidently was not in a mood to ask for it. Evans, therefore, though never a Presbyterian, approximates very closely to that select class distinguished by Calamy as having refused to obey the Visitors but who afterwards did great things for Nonconformity.[6]

Surely enough has been said to show that the confusion inherent in the vicissitudes of the time is admirably exemplified in the vagaries of the Visitors; and if some idealist should search for a golden age when wirepulling and subterranean influences were unknown, it would be

[1] *Chirk Castle Accts.* (ed. W. M. Myddelton, 1908), p. 25.

[2] Burrows: *Register*, p. 72. note *a*. Henry himself says never a word in his Diaries of the terms of his answer or of the power that shielded him.

[3] The case of Hamlet Puleston (*infra*, chap. vii).

[4] Burrows: *Register*, p. 101 (18 May, 1648); for expulsion, see p. 104.

[5] Calamy: *Account* (1713), ii, 842.

[6] *Church and Dissenters compar'd as to Persecution* (1719), p. 70. Calamy attacks Walker for ignoring this group in his "Sufferings" of 1714.

well for him to pass the Puritan period by on the other side. The exercise of such pressure was as rampant with the Parliamentary committees of the Rump and its predecessor as at any time, before or since: even the lofty millenarian Harrison is found delicately imposing a nominee of his upon the Committee of Accounts as registrar;[1] and it is not altogether pleasant to find out that the real reason for delaying operations against Dr. Oliver Lloyd as Fellow of All Souls was that time had to be marked until the conflicting claims of two Puritan candidates for the Fellowship were settled and a somewhat bitter disagreement between the Visitors and the London Committee composed.[2] To vary the angle of vision, should any one be curious to see how a rich foundation like Christ Church pleaded for special treatment by sending up its charters to Parliament and condescending to "lobby" the members thereof, let him read the letter found in Calamy's "Continuation of the Account" (1727), Vol. I, p. 96;[3] one need not waste time in vain imaginings as to whether the letter was hearkened to or no, especially remembering that one of its writers was Dr. Edward Reynolds, both Dean of Christ Church and a very prominent member of the Visiting body, and that the recipient was the learned John Selden, M.P. for the University and a member also of the powerful London Committee for Regulation. The atmosphere of Visitation Oxford fairly reeked of self-interest. And how far this self-interest, a desire to keep good Fellowships and other places of emolument, coupled (in many breasts) with a hope that Providence would yet outwit the successes of Puritan generals, managed between them to batter down the syllogisms of Sanderson and Zouch can be seen in the fact that while above 400 suffered the final agonies of expulsion, *about an equal number* (counting in the Puritans of the Halls) ultimately submitted and retained their places, Dr. Richard Zouch himself keeping on as Regius Professor of the Civil Law.[4]

[1] *H.P.M.*, p. 184 (n. 5).

[2] Burrows: *Register*, pp. 319, 327, 336—337. It was assuredly more than a coincidence that on the same day the Fellowship difficulty was solved the Visitors discover that Dr. Lloyd 'had borne arms against the Parliament in the late warrs' and so was ripe for ejection.

[3] He has not seen well to affix the date of the letter, unless the '7 Nov., 1648' which figures on the same page is meant to apply to it.

[4] Walker: *Sufferings*, ii, 68.

That is the lesson taught by collating the names and numbers given by Anthony Wood in the "Historia et Antiquitates," by Dr. John Walker in his "Sufferings," by Montagu Burrows in his very excellent edition of the Visitors' Register in 1881, and by G. B. Tatham in the luminous fifth chapter of his "Puritans in Power" published in 1913. It is all very well for Wood to retail jokes about the claret face of the renegade Robert Whitehall; but was not that antiquary himself, through his mother's interposition, in a similar plight, did he not drink as hard as Whitehall and with him,[1] and did they not both derive some part of the wherewithal to do so from the mercy of the Puritan Visitors whom Wood lashes so mercilessly? Honest opinion there was on both sides, and the courage to ensue it; halfway between these and the interested submitters stood the Presbyterian Puritans who at first refused to submit and then submitted—a group that found their greatest representative in the Dr. John Conant who refused to take the Engagement[2] except on his own terms, and yet became a Visitor himself, Vice-Chancellor of the University, and one of the greatest rectors Exeter College ever had (besides, let it be added, holding the sinecure rectory of Abergele in North Wales).[3] In what category does Charles Edwards come in? He refused to submit as a member of All Souls in 1 June, 1648,[4] but through the efforts of friends (one of them very probably, as in the case of Samuel Jones, being Sir Thomas Myddelton of Chirk) was elected Scholar of Jesus in October of the same year; yet he grumbled in his autobiography that he had to defend clemency in his B.A. disputations in the Lent of 1649. J. C. Morrice says this was a difficult task to set a man who had suffered so much at the hands of the Visitors.[5] Where did the serious suffering fall to his lot,

[1] For proof of this, see *Life and Times*, i, 279.

[2] This was the oath of loyalty to the Commonwealth exacted early in 1650 (Firth and Rait: *Acts and Ords.*, ii, 325, 348); for the full statement made by Conant on this occasion see Calamy: *Contin.* (1727), i, 113.

[3] As to some of the conditions under which he held this rectory, see *Lambeth Augmentation Book* 1004, f. 53; see *infra*, p. 16 (n. 4).

[4] Burrows: *Register*, p. 122. His exact words were—'I humbly submitt to this Visitation, as farre as its proceedinge be accordinge to the Lawes of the Land and the Statutes of the Universitie'.

[5] *Wales in the Seventeenth Century*, p. 184.

especially when we read on the same page of further promotions coming his way in the same year? Was not his having to defend clemency at all, instead of opposing it, a merely accidental choice of the University authorities? Was Edwards not an eminently fit person to discourse on clemency? "Gwr annwyl oedd Charles Edwards" is the very recent verdict of another writer whose judgements on things literary are usually sound and sane;[1] if he will examine Lambeth Aug. Book 1004, f. 50, collate ff. 62 and 92 in the MS. discovered at Dr. Williams' Library in 1912 and edited by Alexander Gordon in 1917;[2] and note the facts given by that editor on pp. 257-258, he will find convincing reasons for changing his particular opinion concerning the author of "Hanes y Ffydd" and "Hanes y Ffydd Ddiffuant." It is idle to deny that Charles Edwards did subscribe at all times to some sort of Puritanism; but in the constructive history of that movement in Wales he was easily outshone by several Oxford men of his generation, notably by three who at first, like himself, refused to give direct submission to the Puritan Visitors.

(ii) The Jesus Visitation.

The election of Charles Edwards to a scholarship at Jesus meant that he had surrendered to the Visitors and succeeded to the place of some Scholar of that College who had resolutely refused to submit and ventured to abide by that resolution. It was on a black Thursday, 18 May, 1648, that the members of Jesus then in residence were summoned to give their several answers to the all-important question. Seventeen appeared. First in order comes the answer of Thomas Wilkins, son of Roger Wilkins of Marychurch in Glamorgan.[3] Says Wilkins:—

> "In civilitie and with all faire respects as unto private Gentlemen, I returne you myne Answere: I cannot submitt to your Visitation without betrayinge the
>
> Just { Prerogative / Priviledge } of my { Pater Patriae, the Kinge: / Alma Mater, the Universitie:
>
> The which I neither ought nor will doe",

[1] Rev. Ll. G. Williams in '*Y Genedl Gymreig*' (8 Aug., 1922).

[2] '*Freedom after Ejection*' (matter pertaining to Wales will be found transcribed on pp. 141-150).

[3] *Liber Matric. PP*, f. 243^{v} (name entered sub 9 July, 1641).

a very firm and very respectful answer.[1] Next came John Hughes—not a Fellow as Walker says,[2] but a mere bateller,[3] and not to be confused with the John Hughes of Clark's Registers,[4] nor with the John Hughes who was precentor of Llandaff from 1611 to 1645[5]—who wrote down as follows :—

> "Seeinge I have not soe large a conscience as to entertaine everie cruditie of Doctrine : Bee it known unto you that I will not (were it to save my life) nor can as a member of this Universitie, or as a Student of Jesus Colledge, acknowledge this present Parliament, much lesse submitt thereto, nor to your pretended authoritie, as derived from them",[6]

an answer which saw him in the custody of the Provost Marshal of the Oxford garrison before nightfall.[7] History knows nothing of this proper and stout Welshman, as Wood would have called him, unless he might be the Jesus man of that name who was admitted B.D. on 12 September, 1661 ;[8] and curiously enough, historians have dealt quite unworthily with the answer itself. Walker, it is true, refers to it as one of the six boldest rejoinders of the whole Visitation, but only gives a paraphrase of its content ;[9] Tatham in an argument that Walker's list of six was unhappily chosen, seeing that most of them submitted afterwards, omits all mention of Hughes[10] (who happened not to change his mind) ; neither says a word that he was the only member of the whole University who had the grim honour of a visit to the quarters of the Provost Marshal ; while Burrows fails to see why Hughes was singled out for punishment, inasmuch as other Jesus answers were equally uncompromising.[11] He does concede that Hughes' demeanour might have been peculiarly vehement ; I think he also ought to concede that though

[1] Burrows : *Register*, pp 98-99. [2] *Sufferings*, ii, 120.

[3] *Clark's Yearly Lists of Jesus College*, compiled from Buttery Books in 1912, f. 40 et seq. (sub anno 1647, section ix).

[4] *Reg. Univ. Oxon.*, vol. II, pt. i, p. 401.

[5] *Cymmrodor*, xxxi, 233-234 (art. on *Chapter of Llandaff*, by the Lord Bishop of Monmouth).

[6] Burrows : *Register*, p. 99. [7] *Ibid.*, p. 100.

[8] *Tanner MS.* 338, f. 103. Wood applies the virtue of stoutness to a Welshman (an unusual compliment from him) in the case of David Thomas, a B.A. of Jesus who was usher of the school at Thame when Anthony was a pupil there (*Life and Times*, i, 108, 124).

[9] *Sufferings*, i, 136 (col. 1). [10] *Puritans in Power*, p. 177.

[11] *Register*, footnote *a* on p. 100.

Flower's reply had in it a spice of insolence, that of Hughes was at once more angular in outlook and more extensive in its area of offence. Philip Flower, Fellow of the College, a Monmouthshire man born at Chepstow,[1] very possibly son of James and Eleanor Flower of that place,[2] smarting already under the double indignity of having been ejected by one of the Puritan committees from the rectory of Llangattock-iuxta-Usk[3] and from the Llandaff prebend of "William Clark,"[4] now practically certain of losing his Fellowship at the hands of another—answered as follows :—

> "I dare not condemne my selfe to receive a portion with hypocritte in yeldinge upp (as I cannot obtaine sufficient reasons yet to judge otherwise) my conscience and rightful liberties, to the present demanders of my submission".[5]

He was not consigned to the tender mercies of the Provost Marshal, but his answer (as was that of Hughes) was to be reported verbatim to the Committee for Regulation sitting in London.[6] What further punishment, other than expulsion, either of them received is not recorded.[7] It is quite evident from the terms of several answers that anxious moments had been spent in consultation beforehand (as was the case in many other colleges) : the young man William Price,[8] Humphrey Boulton of Beaumaris, James Penry of Devynnock, William Parry of Denbigh,[9] Theodoret Bassett, George Evans, James Quarrell, and Peter Meyrick all based their non-submission either on qualms of conscience or on the assertion that the authority

[1] Spelt "Chudspton" in MS. *Topog. Oxon.*, e. $\frac{105}{5}$ (MS. *notes of Andrew Clark at Jesus College*).

[2] In a letter to the present writer, dated 9 October, 1922, Col. Bradney enclosed a deed-copy of 1622 (*Not. Tal.*, xvii, 68) in which a Philip Flower figured as one of four parties : but he hardly thinks he is the same Flower on the ground that the Fellow of Jesus was only 13 years old at the time.

[3] *MS. J. Walker*, e. 7, f. 215[b] (mis-spelt "Fowler").

[4] *Cymmrodor*, xxxi, 227 (the learned author does not actually say he lost the prebend, but it is inconceivable that he could have kept it).

[5] Burrows : *Register*, p 99.

[6] *Ibid.*, p. 104.

[7] Under 24 May, 1648, the Register has the following entry:—"In the case of Mr. Hughes, of Jesus Colledge, it is left to the Provice Chancellor to doe as hee sees cause" (Burrows, p. 109).

[8] *Liber Matric. PP*, f. 243[v] testifies that he matriculated on 16 Oct., 1647, *age 16*.

[9] He signs his answer as "J. W. Parry" (Burrows, p. 100).

of the Visitors was "pretended" and not derived from the King; some of them also refer to the considered "Judgement" of the University and to the statutes of their own College. Five others—Andrew Savage, Thomas Morgan of Cardiganshire,[1] Whitgift Gibbon[2] (for some reason the Visitors' registrar entered his name twice over), William Wilkins of Glamorgan, and Lewis Williams, son of Maurice Williams of Hafodgaregog in Merioneth[3]—were content with the simple statement that they refused to submit. Thomas Ellis, son of Griffith Ellis of Dolbenmaen, later to be known as a distinguished if disappointed antiquary and rector of Dolgelley after the death of his kinsman Dr. John Ellis, was evidently put into great tribulation of mind by the turn of events, as witness his long but interesting signed statement:—

> "After a seriouse and diligent consultation had with my owne Conscience, I have at length pitched upon this resolution: That I cannot submitt to this your Visitation without the hazard of shipwrackinge of my soule: how pretiouse a thing that is to everie man, I neede not insist to tell you: I beseech God the Father of Mercies to strengthen me with his grace for the mentayninge of a good conscience while I am
>
> Thos. Ellis".[4]

An attitude typical of a man who (according to Wood) bore arms for the King within the city and could also write letters supporting the side of the Parliament.[5] On the other hand, Vice-Principal Adams had been a zealous reformer from the beginning;[6] one of the Fellows, James Vaughan, could not appear before the Visitors till 11th October, and then submitted.[7] Five weeks later the axe fell on Daniel Brevint of Jersey,[8] an old student of

[1] He is so described on the assumption that Burrows' entry on p. 503 (*Register*) is correct.

[2] Gibbon could not be above 17 (*Liber Matric. PP*, f. 243ᵛ; matriculated 13 Dec., 1647, age 16).

[3] So described in *Liber Matric. PP*, f. 243, matriculated 28 May, 1641; Foster: *Alumni Oxon.*, iv, 1642. [4] Burrows: *Register*, pp. 99-100.

[5] E G. Hardy: *Jesus College*, p. 123,—"if a letter signed Thomas Ellis, describing the fight at Copredy Bridge, is his."

[6] *Supra*, p. 6; also Burrows: *Register*, pp. 202, 209.

[7] Burrows: *Register*, p. 100. According to Principal Hardy, he had been Fellow since 1628 (*Jesus Coll.*, App. iii, p. 239). The statement by Foster (*Alumni Oxon.*, iii, 1536) that he *lost* his Fellowship in 1648 is an absurd mistake.

[8] Burrows: *Register*, p. 198 (order for expulsion made on 16 Nov., 1648; finally operative on 15 Jan., 1648-49).

Saumur in France, and one of the picturesque elements imported into Jesus (together with Exeter and Pembroke) as a result of the Channel Islands fellowships founded by Charles I. in 1635.[1] Two months after that, in January, 1648-1649, it was discovered that Henry Pugh, son of Robert Pugh of Penmachno and Scholar of the College (matriculated in 1639, graduated B.A. in 1643, M.A. some time later[2]), had left the society in 1645 and was now enjoying a living in the country; his name is bracketed with that of Brevint as formally and finally outed.[3] But did the Visitors know that this living was the vicariate of Abergele, and that Pugh had been solemnly sanctioned as Puritan minister there by the Committee for Plundered Ministers eleven months before?[4] More important than the answer to this question is the incompleteness of the Register itself; for example, it contains not a word of nine or ten Fellows whose names were on the Buttery Book at the end of 1647 and who are known to have held Fellowships right up to the date of the Visitation[5] (of whom the most prominent were the William Lloyd who was in after years to attain fame as one of the Seven Bishops and Owen Wynne, in happier days D.C.L. and secretary to Sir Leoline Jenkins[6]). Nor is there any record in the same Register of men other than Fellows who were in residence up to May, 1648, but are found no more on the pages of the Buttery Books. It must be presumed that these all suffered for the contempt of non-appearance.

Keeping exclusively to the records of the Register from the answer of Thomas Wilkins to the belated discovery concerning Henry Pugh, duly noting the names of Jesus men removed from their respective places as they occur

[1] For the King's letters-patent, dated 17 June, 1635, see *Tanner MS.* 338, f. 54.

[2] *Liber Matric. PP*, f. 243; Foster: *Alumni Oxon.*, ii, 1218.

[3] Burrows: *Register*, p. 198—"upon certeficate of 3 yeares absence from the Colledge".

[4] *H.P.M.*, p. 63. When Dr. John Conant was made rector in 1657, Pugh's maintenance had to be advanced to the yearly sum of £100 before the Doctor could enjoy any of the profits.

[5] E. G. Hardy: *Jesus College*, App. iii, 239-240 (list of Fellows); compare also Clark's *Yearly Lists* and his remarks written in *Bodl. MS. Topog. Oxon.*, c. 173, sub anno 1648.

[6] H. O. Coxe: *Catalogue of MSS. in the Library of All Souls* (1842), p. iv; *Life and Times*, iii, 413.

in the folios of the Wood MS. F. 35[1] and on p. 8 of the "Oxonii Lachrymæ" published in London in 1649,[2] and remembering also that only two (Vaughan the Fellow and Adams the Vice-Principal) had satisfied the tests of the Visitors, one might rashly come to the conclusion that all the others ostracised in the Visitors' Register had been ignominiously sent down. Sober truth says that not more than 13 all told fell into this category. There is no contemporary account, as far as the present writer is aware, which explains why the other non-submitters found favour and were allowed to stay; most probably they gave in the appropriate answer on or before 1 September, 1648, the last day of indulgence allowed by the London Committee.[3] Thomas Morgan and Peter Meyrick are discovered taking their degree of B.A. later on, the first in 1652, the second in 1653;[4] Meyrick indeed became master of the Puritan free school in Swansea early in 1655.[5] Notwithstanding the laconic refusal of Lewis Williams and the danger of Thomas Ellis shipwrecking his soul, the two did ultimately give in and the names of both (Ellis signing as Censor of the College) are found subscribing serious charges against the Puritan principal in 1656.[6] Even of those who were undoubtedly expelled, two virtually submitted to the Puritan régime, not as members of Jesus but as ministers in the country sanctioned by the Puritan Triers: Andrew Savage became vicar of Llanbrynmair on 10 June, 1654,[7] and Theodoret Bassett settled down to pastoral work at Merthyr Dovan in 1658.[8] There is also considerable ground for thinking that James Quarrell conformed to Puritan standards by becoming vicar of Llanfetherin in 1649, only, however, to be ejected therefrom by the Propagators in the following year.[9] William Lloyd returned to Oxford, but not to Jesus; he managed to enter

[1] Especially ff. 241, 246, 247. 249, 253, 256ᵛ, 271ᵛ.
[2] There is a copy in the Bodleian Library [Wood 515 (54)]
[3] Burrows: *Register*, pp. 213-214.
[4] *Reg. Congregn. QA*, f. 201, sub 8 April, 1652 (Morgan); f. 201ᵛ, sub 2 April, 1653 (Meyrick).
[5] *Lambeth Aug. Book* 972, f. 137. [6] *Wynne MS.* 239, f. 578.
[7] *Exchequer Miscellanea*: *Return of Sheriff of Montgomery*, dated 28th April, 1658, pencilled p. 118 on parchment.
[8] Thos. Shankland: *Seren Gomer*, Nov. 1901, p. 323.
[9] *MS. J. Walker*, e. 7. f. 219. In *Liber Inst.*, Llandaff, f. 111, the name is down as *George* Quarrell.

Wadham in 1658 as " private " tutor to a young Berkshire gentleman of that College and repaid this favour by organising the notorious hoax of September, 1659, at the Mitre Inn which so greatly incensed the Puritan grandees of the University.[1] Philip Flower did return to Jesus in 1657—to be buried in the College chapel.[2] As to George Evans, the only conclusion to be drawn from the Cambridge registers of Dr. Venn, the " Alumni " of Foster,[3] and the Dict. Nat. Biog.,[4] is that he—the only academic George Evans of the time[5]—migrated from one Jesus College to another, and was re-incorporated as an M.A. of Oxford on 11 July, 1654. Not so is the record of the dilatory submitting Fellow James Vaughan : he was later lifted to the higher dignity of Vice-Principal only to be dispossessed during the turmoil of the Roberts administration. Coming to those who were irretrievably expelled and who did not compromise themselves directly or indirectly (three of these, counting Quarrell, were sons of Anglican clergymen[6]), their careers are for the most part wrapped in a most tantalising obscurity, at least until the Restoration. Daniel Brevint crossed over first to his native Jersey, then to France, was present on Trinity Sunday, 1650, at the house of the Cavalier Ambassador in Paris, became later pastor of a Protestant congregation in Normandy and chaplain to Marshal Turenne ; after the Restoration he became successively prebendary of Durham and dean of Lincoln, developing into an able and virulent opponent of the Church of Rome and an unmerciful interpreter of Canon 122 to the disadvantage of Nonconformists.[7] James Penry re-appears in 1665 as Anglican schoolmaster in his native Devynnock and before

[1] F. G. Hardy: *Jesus College*, p 143; *Life of Anthony à Wood* (pub *Eccl. Hist. Soc.* in 1848) pp. 98-99; *Life and Times*, i, 282-283.

[2] Foster: *Alumni Oxon.*, i, 510.

[3] *Ibid.*, i, 469.

[4] Vol. xviii, 52.

[5] The Dolben Papers refer to a servant of the Bishop of Gloucester named George Evans who was accused of behaving in an indecorous manner at the Cathedral of Bristol in June, 1669 (*Bodl. Addit. MSS.* c. 302. ff. 176, 178, 181).

[6] *Liber Matric. PP*, f. 243^{v} (Gibbon, Penry, Quarrell).

[7] *Dict. Nat. Biog.*, iii, 56; vi, 290-292; Calamy: *Account*, ii, 466. In a work recently published it is made clear that Brevint in 1660 was busy, by bringing French Protestant opinion to bear, in an effort to get English Presbyterians to agree to moderate Episcopacy (Alex Robertson: *Life of Sir Robert Moray*, 105, 107).

the end of the same year as rector of Cefnllys;[1] William Wilkins was instituted vicar of Llandyfodwg in 1660;[2] and it is safer to see in William Parry a gentleman of Denbighshire who gravitated to the profession of law[3] than a vicar of Llandogo in Monmouth who figures on one of the Exchequer Depositions.[4] As to Thomas Wilkins, he became (according to Foster) rector of Gelligaer at the Restoration and acceded to other valuable preferments in the chapter and diocese of Llandaff;[5] he was a book-loving antiquary as well, being in possession (about 1690) of the text of a precious MS. of the "Drych Cristianogawl" composed by Dr. Gruffydd Roberts of Milan.[6] A word should be said about a William White described on p. 107 of Professor Burrows' edition of the Register as a non-submitter of Jesus and deserving of expulsion; but this entry is undoubtedly a clerical error for the White who was master of Magdalen free school and is referred to as such on pp. 97 and 103.

This obsession with the fortunes of Fellows and Scholars (including the Magdalen schoolmaster), batellers and commoners, has made us forget the fate of the renowned Principal, Dr. Francis Mansell, who had hied to his beloved College upon the rumour of the coming Visitation. It was on the 18th day of May, 1648, that the incriminating answers of the rank and file were given in; the Principal's turn came on the following day, when an order was made by the London Committee that on account of his high contempt and denial of the authority of Parliament—a Restoration authority puts it "for not takeing the Covenant and for not submitting to a Visitation from ye Rebells"[7]—the aforesaid Principal was to be removed and a new Principal elected in his stead. The same order

[1] *Lambeth MS.* 639 (Tenison Codex), f. 335: Bishop's Certificates, First Fruits, St. David's, File 14, Schedule 20 Oct., 1664—20 Oct., 1665.

[2] *Llandaff Certifs.*, File 10, Schedule 20 Apr., 1660—20 Apr., 1661.

[3] *Liber Matric. PP.* f. 235^v; *Alumni Oxon.*, ii. 1122.

[4] 12-13 Charles II, Hilary, Monmouth, No. 5 (the reference is to a vicar of that name a good many years before 1660—1661).

[5] *Alumni Oxon.*, iii, 1633; *Cymmrodor*, xxxi (1921), 232. He was admitted LL.B. from Jesus, 12 Sept., 1661 (*Tanner MS.* 338, f. 103).

[6] This MS. is now at the Cardiff Free Library and the name "Tho. Wilkins" is written on the first folio (Mr. Ifano Jones in *Western Mail*, 19 Sept., 1922).

[7] *Wynne MS.* 240, f. 510.

included the latter's name; he was Michael Roberts, B.D., an old Fellow of the College who had lost his emoluments in 1638 because he did not proceed to his Doctorate within the statutable time. The Senior Fellow was ordered to publish the whole order to the College and enter it on the register.[1]

(iii) Hypocrite and Adventurer.

It was at this poignant juncture that Roberts was hastening slowly (as the event will amply prove) to take up the headship of the society which had discarded him ten years before[2]—just when fiery souls like John Hughes and Philip Flower were pouring out anathemas against the Puritan inquisitors, just when the swashbuckling retort of the bateller was fast becoming a cherished tradition wherever Jesus men gathered together, just when other "expelled" members were lagging behind[3] in the assured hope that a new war would free the country at large and Oxford in particular from the incubus of a Puritan soldiery, at the crisis when conscientious souls like Thomas Ellis were on the horns of a dilemma between loyalty to the College and care for the bread and butter of this life, at a time when Jesus' great Principal, notwithstanding the "professions" of the Chancellor and the evident reluctance of the powers that were,[4] had been officially ejected (though not actually turned out) from the institution he had fostered with so great a solicitude—it was to this unwelcome environment that fate had consigned the new Principal. What welcome indeed could

[1] Burrows: *Register*, p. 105. The Visitors acted on the order three days later (22 May); Walker is incorrect in saying that the Committee ejected him on that date (*Sufferings*, i, 137).

[2] E. G. Hardy: *Jesus College*, p. 94, assigns his dismissal to the year 1637, but the *Wynne MS.* quoted above asserts Roberts "was turn'd out and his place declar'd void" at the beginning of Febr., 1637-1638.

[3] Burrows: *Register*, lists on pp. 137, 138, 139 ("first Expulsion"); lists on pp. 144, 145 ("second Expulsion"); p. 161 (reference to laggards who "doe stay neere about the towne to the danger of the place"); also note on p. 590.

[4] E. G. Hardy: *Jesus College*, pp. 108-109. The Chancellor (Pembroke) was Mansell's near kinsman, and his two younger sons had been for several years gentlemen commoners in the College. [In these pages Principal Hardy is quoting from a *Life of Francis Mansell* attributed to Sir Leoline Jenkins, and privately printed in 1858.]

be given a man who (even before his dismissal in 1638) had so forgotten his duty to his College as to do the disservice of diverting from it the bounty of a noble benefactor?[1] The situation in 1648 called for a Head of undoubted learning, of high academic lustre, of consummate prudence, of assured administrative genius; if the Committee and Visitors meant to set Jesus on a new spiritual orientation, it called also for a Puritan of the deepest dye. The unpalatable truth must be told that Roberts had never been a good Puritan and was to plunge the College into the most turbulant nine years in its whole history.

Not that he lacked letters. One is tempted just here to follow Anthony Wood and tell the story of a visit paid to a bookseller's shop in Oxford by Dr. Peter Heylin, Archbishop Laud's biographer, and then very nearly blind (it was soon after the restoration of the King). The proprietor was not in and Heylin bade the apprentice tell his master that "the doctor that could not reade was to speake with him." "What, Sir," replied the prentice, "are you one of the Doctors of the late times?"[2] The great Anglican controversialist was, needless to say, delighted at the double hit. But let no one harbour the idea that Roberts was as bad as that; in truth, no Oxford D.D. was. Indeed, for romantic variety of University experience, he could put up a record not surpassed by many of his contemporaries. Born in the parish of Llanedwen in Anglesey—his father's people hailing from Llandrygarn in the same county[3]—an eldest son who boasted not a little of the world's possessions in the form of land,[4] he resided for some time (if his own words preserved in one of the Tanner MSS. are to be believed) at Caius College in Cambridge;[5] from there he soon migrated to Trinity College,

[1] *Wynne MS.* 240, f. 511. Unfortunately, the name of the possible benefactor is not given. Was it the rent-charge of £50 a year on the Lordship of Margam intended by Sir Lewis Mansell for the College which was frustrated? (Hardy: *Jesus College*, p. 93.)

[2] *Life and Times*, i, 352-353.

[3] These two pieces of evidence are derived from his will preserved in the University Archives.

[4] *Tanner MS.* 314, f. 48.

[5] *Ibid.*, f. 50. He was there, he says, with Dr. William Lucy, Restoration bishop of St. David's. As Lucy did not come to Cambridge until 1615 (*D.N.B.*, xxxiv, 251) and Roberts was at T.C.D. in 1616, their companionship at Caius must perforce have been short. A closer study of the context seems to show he was referring to his stay at Cambridge in 1624, the year when Lucy proceeded to his doctorate.

Dublin; he matriculated in 1616, became Scholar of the College on 28 October, 1617, graduated B.A. in the summer of 1620 and M.A. three years later;[1] next we hear of him incorporated at both Oxford and Cambridge in 1624,[2] elected Fellow of Jesus the following year and Bursar in 1631; seven years later came his "amotion" for not taking the degree of Doctor in Divinity "ante quartum annum a suscepto gradu Baccalaureatûs."[3] Roberts, however, did not let that disaster happen without giving proof of the stubborn pugnacity which brought him such notoriety in later years. He exercised the right of appealing to the legal Visitor of the College[4] (just then conveniently attending King Charles at Woodstock), who summoned to his assistance Dr. Bryan Duppa, the Vice-Chancellor of the University, and Dr. Samuel Fell, the dean of Christ Church; before these luminaries Roberts pleaded that a leave of absence granted him from November, 1637, until the following May took the case out of the statute of Degrees, that his lack of preferment and estate were not sufficient to support the dignity of a Doctor and so entitled him to a dispensation from the too rigid interpretation of the same statute, and that in any case his Fellowship was a freehold, arguing from this that any process of ejection was "ultra vires." The Principal and Fellows were able to make short work of such eccentric reasoning (eccentric in more senses than one), and after a solemn hearing the Visitor allowed the deposition to pass "in rem iudicatam."[5] The ex-Fellow was never the man to pine away in unfruitful discontent or close his eyes to the possibility of good preferment; and Principal Hardy's cautious suggestion that not long after he acceded to the living of Llangynwyd ("yr hen blwyf")[6] is fully borne out by an entry in the "Liber Institutionum" of Michael Roberts being admitted vicar there on 30

[1] For information of his career at Dublin, the writer is much indebted to letters received from the Asst. Librarian of Trinity and T. U. Sadleir, Esq., Lansdowne Road, Dublin.

[2] Dr. John Venn: *Book of Cambr. Matrics. and Degrees*, (1544—1659), p. 568.

[3] He was B.D. since 8 July, 1630 (*Alumni Oxon.*, iii, 1263).

[4] He was the same Earl of Pembroke as the Chancellor of 1648.

[5] For a retrospective account of these proceedings (written from a hostile standpoint in 1668-1673), see *Wynne MSS.* 239, ff. 579, 579ᵛ, 580; 240, ff. 510-511.

[6] *Jesus College*, p. 117.

January, 1638-1639;[1] let it also be understood that when in full possession of his Fellowship at Jesus he had for some time been allowed to hold the adjoining benefice of Margam, valued at £120 per annum.[2] At Llangynwyd, by all accounts, he was when the Civil War broke out some three years afterwards. As the following paragraphs will deal with his doings from 1642 to 1648, it is necessary at this point to make these two statements: there are strong reasons for believing that the Committee's appointment to the headship of Jesus came as a surprise to Roberts (he himself says it was unexpected); and he seems to have delayed his arrival in Oxford till about the Christmastide of 1648.[3]

A few months after that and but a few weeks after he was solemnly created D.D.,[4] a series of startling charges involving malignancy and delinquency were brought against the new Principal before the Parliamentary Committee for the Advance of Money.[5] These charges were carried from Wales to London by drovers (convenient Mercuries of gossip in the old days), stated before the Committee by the prominent Parliamentary captain Richard Price of Gunley in Montgomery, and supported (in so far as attaching their names to the foot of the indictment lay) by persons no less important than Colonels Thomas Mytton of Halston and John Jones of Maesygarnedd—who had jointly been responsible for the reduction of Anglesey in 1648—and followed by men only slightly less prominent than those two, including Oliver Thomas, the probable author of "Carwr y Cymry" (1631), the certain author of "Drychau Ysbrydol" (1647), and

[1] Diocese of Llandaff, deanery of 'Gronethe'. A Michael Roberts had been made vicar of Llanbadrig in Anglesey on 22 Sept., 1628 (*Liber Inst., Bangor*, deanery of Talybolion).

[2] *Wynne MS.* 240, f. 511. This circumstance makes it practically certain that the benefaction diverted from the College by Roberts (for some mysterious reason) was that designed by Sir Lewis Mansell (*supra*, p. 21 and n. 1).

[3] Inference from the answers of his personal servant John Roberts in July, 1649 (*St. Pap. Dom. Interreg.*, A. 130, No. 32).

[4] 6 April, 1649 (*Reg. Congregn. QA*, ff. 10v, 70, 180—records of various technicalities).

[5] In the *Calendars of the Comm. for Adv. of Money*, i, Preface (x-xii), will be found the exact reasons why such charges as those brought against Roberts should be presented to this Committee and no other.

soon to be made "approver" under the Welsh Propagation Act. But what were these startling charges? In the first place, that Roberts came voluntarily out of Wales (from Llangynwyd, presumably) into Oxford, and there continued for some time; secondly, that he resided constantly in enemies' quarters "during y^e^ time of y^e^ former war" (meaning the first Civil War), and complied so far with the enemy that he was not disturbed nor molested in his person or estate; thirdly, that when North Wales was reduced (1646-1647) to the obedience of the Parliament he complied so far with the godly party that he was chosen chaplain to the Carnarvon garrison, which post he quitted again in the last insurrection (i.e., that of 1648) and proceeded to join the enemy in his native county of Anglesey; next, that he proved himself such a delinquent as to "list" himself in the troop of the Cavalier Colonel Bulkeley and marched with horse and arms "to most of their Randesvouses," even threatening those who refused to do the same. Being taken prisoner by the Parliamentary forces, he ransomed himself out of their hands. The accusers refer to his Oxford promotion only to add how dilatory he had been to obey the mandate of the Committee.[1] These charges were levelled against him on 8 May, 1649; and it was not until more than seven weeks later (29 June) that the Committee for the Advance of Money seriously addressed themselves to the case by giving the Doctor just a week to formulate his answer.[2] That answer took the form of a petition to the honourable Committee which for a mixture of affected indignation, artistic gestures of challenge, and delicate witticisms bordering on buffoonery, it is hard to beat. Did he not as a minister publicly pray for the Parliament's cause both in Welsh and English, and that in perilous times and places? Did he not, before leaving South Wales, refuse to contribute at Cardiff to the war against the Parliament? Did not Sir Nicholas Kemeys and others of the King's commissioners of array, when they heard of his refusal to provide and set out a light horse for the Royal forces, cause him above £500 loss, deprive him of

[1] *St Papers Dom Interreg.*, A. 21, p. 202.

[2] *Ib.*, A. 7, p. 111. Before coming to this conclusion this Committee examined three witnesses as to the truth of the charges, a fact which is recorded not on this document, but on the margin of p. 202, A. 21.

all that he had, even to his very books, papers, and notes of study? Was he not driven out from South to North (another confirmation of his Llangynwyd sojourn) to his mother's house in Anglesey, where he lived a private life of affliction for about six years, was he not assaulted on the highway, beaten, and wounded to the effusion of his blood, "yet did preach constantly gratis without any reward or Encouragement from Man"? At this point he remembers his duty to the College, tells the Committee how he has spent his all in attendance upon their honours,[1] and is therefore by his absence from Oxford wanting to the service with which he stands intrusted by the State; then he refers to the multitude of causes coming from all parts of the country before the Committee and "concentring" there, with the result that the defendant's case is like that of the impotent man at the pool of Bethesda, "while ready for heareing another steppeth before." Let him be punished extremely, if he hath deserved it; otherwise, let them seriously weigh the offence of persecuting "one who hath obteyned mercy to bee faithful" to the Parliament's interests.[2] Above and beyond this rhetoric, the new Principal had not been asleep in face of the attack made upon him, for he had secured two depositions on oath to prove his innocence: one, dated 18 June, 1649,[3] by Robert Lewis of Treflesg in the parish of Llanfair yn Neubwll, and the other, witnessed on 4 July, 1649, by his own personal servant John Roberts, who had been with him in Oxford since the Christmas of 1648. Lewis deposed that he knew nothing of the latter's Cavalier activities in support of Colonel Bulkeley and that he never heard him preach but three times—once in Carnarvon when it was a garrison for the Parliament, another

[1] Roberts manipulated a very long bow: within this one 'petition' he has twice spent (or been despoiled) of his 'all'; and was any sensible person to believe that the emoluments of Margam plus his Jesus Fellowship were between them not sufficient in 1637—1638 to support the Doctorate he refused to qualify for?

[2] *State Pap. Dom. Interreg.*, A. 130, No. 25.

[3] Assuming this date to be correct, Roberts must have secured Lewis' statement in anticipation of the Committee's order of the 29th June, although it is worded as if in answer to an undated questionnaire of the Committee (*St. Pap. Dom. Interreg.*, A. 130, No. 26) which could not very well have been drawn up before the latter meeting. It might be added that more than one of the documents in this case bear no date, except that inserted in pencil in a modern hand.

time at the funeral of Colonel Thos. Glynne of Glynllifon "which was out of Carnarvon,"[1] and a third time at Bodedern in Anglesey—adding that on neither occasion, nor on any other occasion, did he ever hear the said Mr. Roberts use any expressions tending to the prejudice of the Parliament or to the advantage of the King's party.[2] The cunning Principal must have known that this Robert Lewis had intimate connections with the Cavalier Bodvels of Lleyn and Llaneigrad, and that he would swear to the right kind of evidence.[3] The personal servant Roberts knew nothing about anything.[4] Fortified by these negative depositions and evidently sensing the good-will of the Committee, about the middle of July, 1649, Roberts launched in person a second petition before them, asserting that the articles against him were promoted only by malice and ill-will, adumbrating also that he could summon plenty of further good testimony of his affection towards the Parliament, did not those witnesses live 200 miles out of London (the procuring of whom would lay him to great trouble and extraordinary charge). Indeed, he asks the Committee that these people be examined in the country by authorised persons, with the maximum time-limit extended to 29 September following.[5] On 20th July came yet another petition, the third, in which Roberts roundly challenges his accusers to bring forward the exact evidence of Colonel Mytton and others; and should these not be forthcoming, that he should be discharged from further attendance and the articlers mulcted in costs for the molestation "undeservedly susteyned" by him.[6] For some unfathomable reason, the prosecution outlined by the Puritan captain in May and supported on paper (or parchment) by such an array of important witnesses, fizzled out; the State Papers are absolutely silent about definite proofs being brought home to him; and on

[1] The State Paper does not expressly say that he was a Glynne of Glynllifon; however, as his name disappears from the records of the county with 1648, there is no room for much doubt on the subject. The writer has had the advantage of consulting Mr. Gilbert Williams of Rhostryfan, who is able to thread his way with uncanny certainty amongst the Glynnes of Plasnewydd, Lleuar, Hendre, and Glynllifon.

[2] *St. Pap. Dom. Interreg.*, A. 130, No. 27.

[3] N.L.W. MS. 1511 E, f. 105 (a document formerly in the Kinmel Collection).

[4] *St. Pap. Dom. Interreg.*, A. 130, No. 32.

[5] *Ibid.*, A. 130, No. 33.

[6] *Ibid.*, A. 130, No. 34

the day (20 July, 1649) that the Principal presented his last petition, the hard-headed lawyers and accountants who constituted the Committee for the Advance of Money decided that Roberts did not appear to be a delinquent or within the terms of the ordinances for sequestration, and that his further attendance before them was not required; in other words, he was saved from the tender mercies of the Committee for Compounding, who were waiting to assess the fines on convicted malignants.[1]

Such was the new Principal's good fortune; such his voice in 1649. How does it comport with his words of 24 years later? By that time Roberts was still at Oxford, quite an old man, deprived of his Principalship three years before the Restoration, thoroughly out of repute with Cavalier and Puritan alike, and dunning the ears of Archbishop Sheldon and Dean Sancroft for some preferment in the Church.[2] Nothing becomes him better now than to recall his irrefragable loyalty to the Church of England and to King Charles I of blessed memory;[3] he lovingly dwells on the names of men, by now reverend deans and bishops either in Wales or Ireland, who had once been his contemporaries as students or bred under him as pupils. Especially does he revert to his ancient friendship with Dr. Robert Morgan of Llanddyfnan in Anglesey (who was Bishop of Bangor from 1667 to 1673), and gets a Master of the Household[4] to speak to the King on his behalf to this effect (the importance of this extract from the Tanner MSS. must be a sufficient excuse for quoting it at some length): "No man had so good Cause to know how Dr. Roberts did behave himself in the evil time as Mr. Robert Morgan then a Parson beneficed in Anglesey:[5] they two lived near neighbours within less then four miles of each other, in all that time. It was by the industry of

[1] *St. Pap. Dom. Interreg.*, A. 7, p. 166.

[2] *Tanner MS.* 314, ff. 4, 5, 6, 21, 24, 25, 48, 50.

[3] In one of the documents at All Souls Library (*Wynne MS.* 240, f. 510) dealing with the Fellowship litigation of 1668-1673, his critics averred he was not turned out in 1657 "for his Loyalty as will be p'tended". But the fact that he was *not* (only for other reasons) is some measure of the old Principal's dissimulation.

[4] Sir Herbert Price of the Priory, Brecon.

[5] In one respect this very estimable clergyman belonged to the same school as Roberts; he managed to hold to the rich living of Llanddyfnan throughout the interregnum.

them both in preaching loyaltie that the people of that Country were so established and confirmed in the Principles of Obedience due to the Soveraign Prince, that when the rebells cam[e] upon them with 2000 soldiers under the leading of Mytten of Shropshire, made slaughter of the poor Countrimen, who had neither pouder nor ammunition, nor skill nor Leaders : when the rebellious rout conquered Anglesey, they utterly failed to find four men among all the inhabitants to side with them, the Parishes being above forescore."[1] Do these post-Restoration admissions not throw a very informing sidelight on the reasons why Roberts delayed coming up to Jesus in 1648? Was he not anxiously awaiting the result of the Carnarvonshire movement of Sir John Owen of Clenennau in June of that year and the raising of the banner of revolt in Anglesey on the 14 July, and did he not stay on in that county until all hopes of a Royalist victory evaporated with the articles of surrender signed on 2 October, although his name is ostentatiously absent from the Cavalier signatories of the treaty?[2] The Puritan articlers of 1649 asserted, but somehow failed to prove, that he betook himself to Oxford on the outbreak of war in 1642 ; his henchmen 24 years later boldly declared that when Oxford was emptied of its scholars after Edgehill fight, Roberts was one of those who was glad to retreat from there to his home in Anglesey,[3] a declaration that does not seem to agree very well with his own account in 1649 of serious losses in money and books from the Glamorgan commissioners of array. Whom are we to believe—Roberts in 1649 or Roberts in 1673? Are we to believe that the one great Puritan produced by Anglesey—pre-eminently the one county in Wales which contributed least to the Puritan movement, with its selfish conformists in 1660, no conventicles in 1669, not a single licence in 1672, only five Nonconformists all told in 1676 (not one of them in Llanedwen or Llandrygarn), and with an atmosphere which even chilled off the penetrating enthusiasm of the

[1] *Tanner MS.* 314, f. 26 (quoted in a letter written by Dr. Michael Roberts on 25 Feb., 1678-1679, to Archbp. Sancroft). But Price seems to have used this information on his behalf in 1673, just when the King was proceeding to elect a new Bishop of Bangor.

[2] J. R. Phillips : *Hist. Civil War in Wales*, ii, Doct. cxvii (B), p. 401.

[3] *Tanner MS.* 314, f. 26 (Sir Herbert Price's statement).

early Quakers[1]—are we really to believe that Dr. Michael Roberts was the one glorious exception, the one Anglesey Puritan who had obtained the mercy to be faithful? Such a theory is too ridiculous for words: Roberts was no more a Puritan than Mansell, and an infinitely smaller man. The Visitors and Committee between them stand condemned of having appointed as Principal of Jesus a Fellow whose continued presence in the society ten years before had become impossible and who had confronted the vicissitudes of those ten years with the arts of an expert opportunist.

And this appointment is the more inexplicable because the Committee and Visitors had the welfare of the colleges closely at heart and on the whole interpreted the governing ordinances in a humane spirit: it was under their auspices that the massive mind of Dr. John Owen was applied to set Christ Church in order,[2] that the learned Wilkins supervised the fortunes of Wadham and the equally learned Goddard those of Merton, that Magdalen walked after the steps of "old Nine Caps,"[3] that Exeter witnessed the marvellous success as rector of Dr. John Conant—the "Conanti nihil difficile" of Bishop Prideaux' pun. It is now too late in the day to denounce the Oxford of the Visitors' jurisdiction as the home of bigotry or of obscurantism, much as Anthony Wood raved and blasphemed against them in his "Antiquitates" and "Athenae," and well as the less-informed Dr. John Walker followed his example in the "Sufferings." It is only just to add that Wood in his more private papers and diaries saw well to use more moderate phrases when he saw his beloved University degenerating amidst the laxity and licence of the Restoration; those who have examined the Register as edited by Montagu Burrows know what a vein of sympathy with the Visitors and of appreciation of their work runs through the balanced sentences of his introduction. Even the pungent controversialist Alexander Griffith devotes a few lines in the "Strena Vava-

[1] This indictment of Anglesey Puritanism is based on Calamy: *Accт.*, ii, 710; *Lambeth MS.* 639 (no entry); *St. Pap. Dom.*, Chas. II. Entry Book 38A (no reference); *Salt MS.* 2112 (Stafford), ff. 402-405 (religious census of 1676).

[2] He became dean in 1650-1651 in succession to Dr. Edward Reynolds, who had refused the "Engagement".

[3] Dr. Thomas Goodwin, one of the foremost of Puritan theologians.

soriensis" of 1654 to extol the ideals of the new Oxford dons at the expense of the lack-learning itinerants who followed in the wake of Vavasor Powell: he wished God would bless their endeavours in order that they, like unto suns, might outshine the glow-worms and drive the bats into their caves once more.[1] Without, however, accepting too literally this interested and insincere tribute of Alexander's and dismissing with an impatient gesture such legal pedantry as made Lionel Shadwell to relegate as a mere appendix to his fourth volume of enactments the Oxford Visitation ordinances,[2] room is certainly left for wonder that it was possible in the new Puritan Convocation to see men like Owen and Conant sitting cheek by jowl with the egregious anchorite who (to believe his own version) had been ploughing the lonely furrow of affliction on his mother's lands in Anglesey. To Roberts himself, as we have said, such an honour was unexpected; to us, unless and until some more light on the appointment comes, we must also repeat that it is simply inexplicable.

(iv) The October Elections.

This chapter has to begin by referring to the first of the three rebutting petitions presented by Roberts before the Committee for the Advance of Money: in that context, following close upon his avowal of surprise at the Oxford promotion, he reveals the unpleasant fact that soon after he took up his duties there one of the junior Fellows "rose ag^{t} him soe high" as to join in promoting articles of delinquency. Indeed, when the original gravamina against the Principal are re-examined it is found that the sixth charge put it that "since his comyng into y^{e} said colledge he hath manefested no affection to y^{e} publique but countenanceth mallegnants . . . notwithstanding he hath beene often called upon to expell them according to y^{e} orders of y^{e} Visitor."[3] Passing by for the moment this

[1] p. 20.

[2] *Enactments in Parlt. specially concerning Univs. of Oxford and Cambridge* (1912), vol. iv, app ii, pp. 260-291; his reasons for the relegation are found in preface to vol. i, pp. v-vi.

[3] *St. Pap. Dom. Interreg*, A. 21, p. 202. The concluding word is undoubtedly "Visitor" in the MS., and might refer to the Earl of Pembroke, who was the legal Visitor of the College. But more than one consideration inclines one to think that a final "s" has been inadvertently left out.

latter charge and also the question whether the articling Fellow had to make reparation in costs and credit to the person appointed to be his governor[1] (as the Principal calls himself), let us rather apply ourselves to find out who this junior Fellow was and then proceed to discuss the new elections of Fellows and Scholars made in October, 1648. Among the several signatories of the document carried up to London by the Welsh drovers was one whose surname is now quite faded out, leaving only "Mr. Jonath" as the contracted prefix; the abbreviation, without any reasonable doubt, finds its full complement in the "Jonathan Roberts" elected Fellow of Jesus on 27 October, 1648[2]—a valiant Puritan who as late as 1681 will be found at the Oswestry town hall standing shoulder to shoulder with Philip Henry opposing the arguments of two of the ablest dialecticians of their day, Bishop William Lloyd of St. Asaph and Henry Dodwell (the Anglican jurist and later non-juror).[3] Henry himself summed up his character, which opinion Calamy found no reason to alter, as that of a true Nathanael and an Israelite indeed.[4] If this be correct (and Henry knew Roberts well), it is a pretty safe conjecture to make that had Dr. Michael Roberts been endowed with the gift of prophecy (as was claimed by many a good Puritan of the time) and could divine the storm and stress of his days as Principal, he would have made some stir to leave the camp of the Anglesey revolters to be in Oxford at the beginning of October and endeavour to reconstruct the new society of Jesus in such a manner as to keep the sacred circle of Fellows free from characters of the type of Jonathan Roberts. Not that he would find it an easy matter, as the Visitors had very naturally suspended the old statutes governing elections and called in a special sub-committee of 13 to examine the fitness of candidates.[5]

[1] This remark occurs in *St. Pap. Dom. Interreg.*, A. 130, No. 25.

[2] Burrows: *Register*, p. 177. All the October elections, as far as the Register goes, will be found recorded on this page.

[3] Philip Henry: *Diaries and Letters* (ed. M. H. Lee. 1882), p. 309. In the *Life* (1698) there is a much fuller account of this six hours' debate. James Owen of Oswestry also took part on the Nonconformist side.

[4] *Life of Philip Henry*, p. 155; *Diaries*, p. 305; Calamy: *Acct.*, ii, 716.

[5] Four Heads of Houses were included among the 13, but Roberts was not one of them. Even if he were, he would not be present in

Nor did a good number of the candidates actually chosen into Jesus pay much tribute to the caution of the Visitors and to the care of the sub-committee. Of the eight Fellows and seven Scholars who succeeded to the places of the dispossessed non-submitters, five Fellows (Brown, Eure, Forward, Talke, Wilcox) and one Scholar (Brice) were unadulterated Englishmen, the Puritan Anglification of Jesus thus affording a counterpart to the Parliament's conquest of Wales by cornets and captains with English names and to the Puritan attack by preachers like Erbery who (though born at Roath) could not hold forth in the Welsh tongue. Very little is known of several of these Englishmen, and the method of entering their names upon the Register has only confused matters: for example, if the "Will: Cockes" of p. 177 stands for the William Cox who was undoubtedly admitted B.A. from Jesus on 27 June, 1649,[1] and is included among the list of new Fellows by both Principal Hardy and Professor Burrows,[2] then it follows that Francis Wilcox (proved by the Bursary Books to be enjoying the privileges of a Fellow) has been ignored altogether by the registrar, and also that the English element amounted to six and not five. The illegibility of the Bursar's entries at this period furnishes another difficulty: while the name of Wilcox and the allowance he received in 1649 are moderately clear, the amount granted to Cox has quite faded out (as to his Christian name, it looks much more like "Jo:" than anything else).[3] Fortunately, these problems of interpretation are not of great importance, knowing that several of these gentlemen stayed for a short time only. It would be ungenerous to call them phantoms, but transient they certainly were, probably embarrassed as well; however, if the William Cox of Jesus is to be equated with the commoner of Merton who was already an M.A. of St. Andrews and who was subsequently to become Fellow of Brasenose, he must be excused from the charge of embarrassment, and placed in a class that felt quite at home in more than one British university and more than one

time for the Jesus elections (Burrows: *Register*, p. 141, order of 5 July, 1648).

[1] *Reg. Congregn. QA*, ff. 100ᵛ, 200; *Reg. Convocn. T*, p. 49.

[2] *Jesus College*, App. III, p. 240; *Register*, p. 504.

[3] *Sub anno*, p. 180.

Oxford college.[1] The scholar Edmund Brice was before long elected to a Fellowship at All Souls,[2] and somewhat later the Fellow Eure to a richer Fellowship at Merton,[3] ultimately becoming Recorder of Salisbury and a member of the Convention Parliament in 1660.

Three of the new Fellows were Cambridge men, a band of new-comers that immensely shocked good Oxonians like Anthony Wood by disregarding the statutes, ignoring "habitus scholastici," wearing their sleeves wide like surplices, and instead of entertaining their friends with a deep cup of college beer going in for tarts, custards, and cheesecakes;[4] to Dr. John Walker in the next generation they had become "a Rabble, a Tribe of Ignorant Schismaticks and Enthusiasts, a colony [while at Cambridge] of Presbyterians or Independent novices" unattached to any college;[5] a worthy Cantabrigian of our day, the late G. B. Tatham, has counted 64 of them who found room and refuge on Oxford foundations.[6] Whether Francis Wilcox, John Forward (unfortunate name!) and Jonathan Roberts (for that anti-Michaelite had been at Cambridge) were great consumers of custards is not known; but ignorant and unattached novices they certainly were not, Forward and Wilcox both erstwhile sizars of Emmanuel, the most Puritan college in Cambridge, and Roberts sizar of Clare, having entered there in the Michaelmas term of 1645.[7] And all three at different times were allowed the terms they had put in at Cambridge to count towards their B.A. degree at Oxford.[8] So much for the Cambridge immigrants.

To Jesus also came two refugees from other Oxford colleges, originally non-submitters, no less than Charles Edwards from All Souls and Samuel Jones from Merton.

[1] *Life and Times*, i, 135; Brodrick: *Memorials of Merton*, pp. 99, 354. [2] In 1650 (Burrows: *Register*, pp. 319, 320, 323, 327, 337).

[3] In 1651 (E. G. Hardy: *Jesus College*, p. 123; Burrows: *Register*, 504). His name is spelt sometimes *Eure*, sometimes *Eyre*, and sometimes *Eyres* (especially in the *Reg. Congregn. QA*).

[4] *Life and Times*, i, 148, 149, 298.

[5] *Sufferings*, i, 139, 140; Wood is especially severe on them in the *Athenæ*, ii, 743. [6] *Puritans in Power*, pp. 183-184.

[7] Dr. John Venn and J. A. Venn: *Book of Matriculations and Degrees*, 1544-1659, passim.

[8] *Reg. Congregn. QA*, f. 4 (Roberts, 8 Dec., 1648); f. 5 (Forward, 13 Feb., 1648-1649); f. 6 (Wilcox, 1 May, 1649). For the latter see also *Reg. Convocn. T*, p. 44.

Both were elected as Scholars. Something has already been said of Edwards;[1] here must come a word or two in reference to remarks made about this election by a veteran writer in the Dictionary of National Biography.[2] There it is admitted he was elected Scholar of Jesus on 27 October, 1648, but that on the 30th of the same month, when the old Fellows and Scholars were forcibly expelled, Edwards was allowed to remain. To these inaccuracies must be rejoined that the Register knows of no forcible ejections on the 30th, but rather forcible intrusions;[3] it is in the highest degree unlikely that Edwards was officially elected on the 27th and only three days later officially allowed to remain; the ultimate retort to the whole argument is that Edwards submitted to the Visitors, and no amount of whitewashing by interested biographers will ever interfere with that bare and undeniable fact. Of these two, notwithstanding the silence of Principal Hardy about Jones, the latter was by far the greater scholar, the greater man, and (as time was to show) the more satisfactory Puritan. Son of John Roberts of Corwen, but born near the castle of Chirk,[4] he spent a short period as servitor at All Souls, then became one of the postmasters of Merton, entering that college about the same time as the antiquary Wood. Very curiously, the scrappiness of the Visitors' Register and the lapses of the Merton antiquary have between them made some mystery of Jones' movements in 1648. To begin with, the admission registers in the Archives refer to more than one Samuel Jones in Oxford about this time, though it is only Samuel Jones of "Denb." that figures in the Jesus Buttery Books;[5] the registrar of the Visitors in chronicling the elections of 1648 has put down "Sam: Jones of P.C.," which can

[1] *Supra*, pp. 11-12.

[2] Vol. xvii. p. 113 (art. by Rev. R. Jenkin Jones, M.A.).

[3] *Infra*, p. 38.

[4] This association of Samuel Jones with both Corwen and Chirk by Dr. Thomas Rees (*Hist. Prot. Noncon.*, 1883, pp. 230-231) does not run very well with Foster's opinion that they were the birth-places of two separate men (*Alumni Oxon.*, ii, 829). That the Jesus man was born near Chirk we know from Calamy, whose informant was James Owen of Oswestry (*Acct.*, ii, 721). The compiler of the '*Chirk Castle Accounts*' (1908) is content with reproducing the entry of Foster (p. 25, n. 79).

[5] *Clark's Yearly Lists, sub anno* 1652 (f. 40 *et seq.*). Chirk happens to be in that county.

only connote, in the absence of any record at Pembroke College concerning a member of that name, Samuel Jones of "Postmasters' College" or Merton (a view upheld by Professor Burrows on pp. 504, 522 of his edition and copied bodily by the Hon. G. C. Brodrick[1]); the allusion in the Register (p. 210) opposite 2 November, 1648, to Samuel Jones of Merton as one "to be chosen into Jesus Colledge with the first"[2] seems to suggest that the "Oct. 27, 1648," on p. 177 only refers to the bracket of *Fellows* elected to Jesus on that date, leaving the names of the *Scholars* to be filled in at odd times until the end of the year;[3] Wood last of all, usually so meticulously accurate over his facts, in saying that the Merton Samuel Jones left Oxford for good after his non-submission, must have got hold of the wrong man.[4] That the Denbigh Samuel Jones stayed on in Jesus first as Scholar and afterwards in higher offices is testified by his later friendship with Philip Henry of Christ Church[5] and Dr. Robert South of the same college[6] (South came up from Westminster School in 1651 and Henry did not leave for Worthenbury before 1653). It is certainly worthy of some comment that the most level-headed Puritan in the South Wales of the Restoration, associated as he is with frequent persecution and the academy of Brynllywarch, should have begun his religious history with a refusal to submit to the Puritan Visitors. And for the purpose of assessing the characters that made up the new Jesus society, it makes too great a demand upon human credulity to believe that Samuel Jones grew to his full height as a Puritan by his migration from Merton to Jesus, aided by the exercise on his behalf of the Myddelton influence (an influence secular in outlook and, to those who follow the wavering Chirk

[1] *Brodrick's Memorials of Merton*, App. E, pp. 352-365 (a catalogue of extrusions and intrusions in that college) are a repetition word by word of Burrows: *Register*, pp. 520-526.

[2] Alexander Gordon's biographical notice of Jones in his '*Freedom after Ejection*' (p. 294) says he was admitted to Jesus on this date and does not say a word of his Merton connection.

[3] If this were indeed so, the heading of this chapter is not quite elastic enough.

[4] *Life and Times*, i, 135-136.

[5] *Diaries*, pp. 313-314, *sub* 5 June, 1682.

[6] Dr. Thos. Rees: *Hist. Prot. Noncon.* (1883), pp. 240-241—letter from South to Jones at "Goitrehen," dated 12 March, 1688 [—1689?].

sympathies with the Parliament, not of necessity pro-Puritan).

Two places removed from Samuel Jones, but within the bracket of Fellows, occurs the bare surname Jones without any Christian prefix attached. The claims of three Thomas Joneses disappear on close examination : Thomas Jones of Nanteos, Fellow of Merton since 1638, did not return to England from the continent till 1649 ;[1] Thomas Jones of Oswestry was made Fellow of University in that year ;[2] and there is no proof that the Thomas Jones who was made rector of Llanfihangel Cefnllys in 1655 and who admitted later in life he had served in arms for the King in the Earl of Dover's regiment about 1646,[3] was a Jesus man at any time. He might indeed be the Merton member who was recommended for election to Jesus in November, 1648,[4] and is found in the Register of Congregation as a Jesus supplicant obtaining dispensation from lectures and grace for B.A. in Trinity term of the same year 1655.[5] In any case, there is no evidence that the recommendation fructified into a Fellowship. Thus we are left with Principal Hardy's entry that the Fellow intruded in 1648 was Laurence Jones,[6] a submitting immigrant from Magdalen Hall whose connection with Wales has not yet been ascertained.[7] Surely we must not pass unnoticed the other elected Fellow named Lloyd whom the Bursary Books and other records prove to be Jenkin Lloyd of Faerdref by Llandyssul, an old student of Jesus[8] to whom no vicissitude of fortune came amiss, to whom no case of conscience ever gave a moment's anxiety, who passed Proteus-like from being a spiritual " approver " under the Propagation Act to be secular M.P. for Cardiganshire in the first Protectorate parliament,[9] conformed in the most approved manner in 1660, was created D.D. in 1661,[10] and ended his life in affluence under the benevolent pluralism which

[1] Burrows: *Register*, pp. 83, 522. [2] *Ib.*, p. 174, 557.
[3] *Exchequer Bills and Answers*, Radnor, No. 21 (Michaelmas, 13 Chas. II). [4] Burrows: *Register*, p. 210.
[5] *QA*, ff, 51, 109. Curiously, there is no mention on f. 203 of his actually been admitted B.A. from Jesus. He styles himself M.A in 1661. [6] *Jesus College*, p. 240. [7] Burrows: *Register*, p. 36.
[8] Admitted 4 Dec., 1640 (*Liber Matric.* PP, f. 243); M.A. in April, 1648 (Foster: *Alumni Oxon.* ii, 925).
[9] W. R. Williams: *Parl. Hist. Princ. of Wales*, p. 30.
[10] *Tanner MS.* 338, f. 103.

obtained in the diocese of St. David's after the Restoration. Next come two more seriously minded men, Owen Price and Timothy Thomas, both new Scholars. The first was from the county of Montgomery[1] and became a Puritan schoolmaster before and after the Restoration; the fact that he was elected on the new foundation on 12 October, 15 days before any of the Fellows, seems to confirm Wood's statement of his being already in the College in the capacity of under-butler.[2] The second left Oxford without a degree, was appointed Puritan minister in Shropshire, married a daughter of John Evans of Penegoes and Balliol,[3] became a close friend of Philip Henry, and was followed by a son and grandson of the same name who were to be pillars of the Baptist cause in the county of Worcester.[4] The list is closed by two Jerseymen elected on the Channel Islands benefaction—Henry du Creetz and Nicholas Pypon—both originally chosen as Scholars, although the latter figures as a Fellow in the Bursar's accounts for 1649 and 1650.[5]

Hungry Cantabrigians, refugees from other Oxford colleges, un-Jesus-like Englishmen, one pushful Scot, two or three convinced Puritans, many Puritan lovers of loaves and fishes, Jerseymen of doubtful regeneration—could the newly elected Principal, now about to leave his mother's house in Anglesey, be able to fuse this unlikely lot into a society of faithful men, fearing God and hating covetousness? Assuming for the nonce the bare possibility of such a miracle of alchemy, how would such a body live and let live with the survivals of pre-Visitation Jesus, with delayed submitters like Thomas Ellis, with the veteran Fellow James Vaughan who had submitted but 16 days before the new elections, with the ex-Principal who was still keeping his rooms at the College and was to keep on doing so well into the summer of 1649? It was not an encouraging omen for present or future peace that the Visitors on the day of the Jesus elections should de-

[1] Foster: *Alumni Oxon.* iii, 1206. Wood says 'natus in Wallia in com . . . . quære M^rs Price [the widow].'

[2] *Life and Times*, ii, 235; Calamy: *Acct.*, ii, 841. Died 25 Nov., 1671.

[3] *Supra*, p. 9.

[4] *Diaries*, passim; Joshua Thomas: *Hanes Bed.* (Pontypridd edn.), pp. 299-300. Died in 1676 (Calamy: *Acct.*, ii, 565).

[5] *Sub annis*, pp. 180, 200.

cide that in all colleges Fellows or Scholars chosen by them were to take their seniority "according to their respective seniorities in the University . . . albeit they were not first elected or admitted into the said Colledges,"[1] a ruling which would at once raise Jenkin Lloyd to a high point of vantage in Jesus; three days later, when the new Fellows of Jesus appeared to take possession of their chambers according to their seniorities they could not do so without summoning the assistance of the Provost Marshal of the garrison—the one college in the whole University where such assistance was found necessary.[2] It was discovered too that an order of the Visitors made on 15 April, 1648, for the suppression of the Book of Common Prayer, had not been observed in Jesus five months afterwards at the end of September, a perilous homage to tradition paid by only one other college at that date (Christ Church),[3] and especially significant in showing how unreal was the so-called submission of men like Peter Meyrick and Thomas Ellis and Lewis Williams.[4] Equally serious was it that by Roberts' arrival the Vice-Principal, Constantine Adams, and detective "delegate" of the Visitors at the College, had been rewarded for his services by a Fellowship at Magdalen;[5] and that James Vaughan, who had singled himself out as the one downright if dilatory submitter, was in November summoned before the Visitors to answer charges made against him[6] —charges not specified in the Register, but probably of the same nature as those marshalled a few months later at the head of the Principal himself. But like the Principal himself, Vaughan seems to have been exonerated. Was it not a real misfortune that the Puritan principal

[1] Burrows: *Register*, p. 208. It was a question decided on a point raised by Exeter. Of the ensuing perturbation in the colleges and the uncompromising attitude of the Visitors, see *Register*, pp. 217, 270, 279.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 209 (30 Oct., 1648). The date is misprinted "October 13" in Hardy's *Jesus Coll.* (p. 111); it would obviously be impossible to put in any Fellows forcibly a whole fortnight before they were elected.

[3] Burrows: *Register*, pp 22, 191. The peremptory demand issued by the V. in September applied to Jesus and Christ Church "in more particuler."

[4] Later (*infra*, p. 42) it will be found that Lewis Williams was probably absent from the College at this juncture.

[5] Burrows: *Register*, p. 171 (elected 10 October, 1648).

[6] *Ib.*, p. 210 (sub 2 Nov., 1648).

should find his lynx-eyed deputy departed and the newly found Puritanism of the Senior Fellow damped by clouds of suspicion, not improbably engendered by that selfsame deputy?

An awkward situation, admittedly. Anglican chicane and Puritan self-interest jostled each other in a confusion equally tragic and equally picturesque. The two elements remained in suspension rather than in solution; how the old stock remaining, as Anthony Wood calls them, were shocked and humbled by the indecorous exuberance of their new friends and fellows is best expressed in the words of that sardonic writer himself, close witness of what he writes of. "The new commers (who mostly were very meane and poore at their first comming) having gotten into good fellowships became wondrous malepert and saucy . . . they went in half shirts, appearing at their brest and out at sleeves, [wore] great bands with tassell band-strings, and Spanish leather boots with lawne or holland tops."[1] The new men openly laughed at the old and flouted them, scarcely gave them the wall, much less the common civility of a hat; in fact, says Anthony, they seldom gave respect to any but the leading person.[2] He is speaking, let it be understood, not of Jesus in particular, but of the whole University; and it is a moot point indeed, in face of certain facts given later in this paper, whether even the leading person at that College could always depend upon either the wall or the hat.

(v) "A High Poynt of Necessitie."

Did Roberts on his arrival whisper his Anglesey confidences in the ears of the old stock? On what terms did he meet his old Principal, with open hand or eyes downcast?[3] There are no means of giving a direct answer; but,

[1] *Life and Times*, i, 149.

[2] *Ibid.*, i, 299. In n. 2 at the foot of this page Clark says that the "old stock" refers to M.A.'s and Fellows of the time before 1641 who still remained in Oxford. But is it not practically certain that Wood has in mind the "old stock" who submitted in 1648? Yet one must take note of the unexpected anomaly that on certain unpleasant conditions "non-submitters" might still remain in the colleges [Burrows: *Register*, pp. 203, 243 (and note *a*)].

[3] In a letter written on 4 Aug., 1668, Roberts refers to the death of Mansell as that of an old friend (*Wynne MS.* 239, f. 592). However, Roberts had also a penchant for calling people "friends" who had no great desire to be ranked as such.

as we have seen, he was charged in 1649 with favouring malignants in the college and taking no steps to remove them, to which charges he gave no answer whatsoever in his various petitionary defences. The Visitors' Register proves that the keys and seals of the College remained in Mansell's hands until the beginning of March, 1649, as he gets a peremptory notice on the 5th of that month to surrender the same and present all College accounts to the appointed Principal within 14 days.[1] Even a month later this had not been done, he being summoned before the Visitors on 12 April to show cause for his disobedience "and to answere to such other Matters as shalbe then alledged and objected against him."[2] The ex-Principal's activities just at this point of time are very glowingly described by his biographer Sir Leoline Jenkins: how with the saluting gesture of the dying gladiator he was ordering accessions from himself and others to the succeeding intruders (900 works from the Montgomery library of Lord Herbert of Chirbury,[3] the impropriate rectory of Holyhead, the revenue of prebends held by himself in Wales, his own magnificent collection of books) and so active in the future interests of the foundation as if no meddling Visitors had ever come to the University.[4] Might not another theory be held to account for his attitude—that Mansell's intimate knowledge of the year's interregnum (we remember he was suspended on 19 May, 1648), of the problems it had generated, his equally intimate knowledge of the Michael Roberts ejected in 1638, had together convinced him the latter's rule in Jesus would be made impossible, and that the Visitors would be ultimately forced to conform to their own high standards in other Oxford appointments by having to select such a Head (even if he be an intruder) in whose hands Mansell's beloved institution would be comparatively safe? Whatever about such a view, it was on 16 May, 1649, that Roberts signed a formal receipt of the ex-Principal's inventory of goods belonging to the College and on May 29th that he took into his custody the 42 sheets of paper on which a catalogue of the books in the library was

[1] Burrows: *Register*, p. 222. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 228.
[3] This piece of information is derived from Aubrey's *Brief Lives*, ed. Clark, i. 309 (n.2).
[4] Quoted in Hardy's *Jesus College*, pp. 112-113.

written ;[1] no doubt the accounts expected much earlier in the year were now duly presented.[2] These things done, he withdrew to Wales to take up his residence at the house of his kinsman Sir John Aubrey at Llantrithyd.

From a sensational statement made by the new Principal nearly two months afterwards before the London Committee for the Advance of Money it almost seems as if Mansell, like Samson of old, had taken the pillars of the temple away with him ;[3] very naturally, Roberts does not attribute this "high poynt of Necessitie" to the departure of the ex-Principal, but to his own prolonged absence in the capital combating the insidious propaganda of one of his own Fellows. "Now in regard of the Principalls absence," that Principal himself is telling the Committee, "the sayd colledge (a new plantation) was driven to so high a poynt of Necessitie as to dissolve & did ipso facto break up House-keeping (a thing unknown in times of health & Peace) to the great prejudice of that societie" and, of course, to the everlasting infamy of the Puritan articler.[4] The utterly disorganised state of the Buttery Books and Bursar's Accounts for the year 1649 make it impossible to say whether the Principal's words were extravagant rhetoric or simple truth. Yet the Bursary Book for that year does speak of £7 being received at various times as admission fees from 5 commoners, 1 semi-commoner, 2 batellers, and two servitors ;[5] the same book details very considerable efforts to get in the rents of the College ; and the Register of Congregation tells of five members of Jesus admitted to the degree of B.A. between the end of February and the end of June in 1649.[6] It is true that Henry Eure on 6 March, 1648-1649, supplicates Congregation that he be presented for his B.A. by an M.A. of some other college than Jesus, owing to none of the latter being present[7] (Lloyd and Vaughan

[1] E. G. Hardy : *Jesus Coll.*, p. 114. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 113.

[3] This identical simile is used by his biographer to describe the possible result of his ejection more than a year before (quoted in Hardy's *Jesus Coll.*, p. 109).

[4] *St. Pap. Dom Interreg.*, A. 130, No. 34—dated 20 July, 1649.

[5] *Sub anno.* p. 178.

[6] *QA*, ff. 199ᵛ, 200. Foster makes Francis Wilcox graduate from St. John's (*Al. Oxon.*, iii, 1629); the fore-mentioned *Register* is very definite he came from "Coll: Jesu,' May 1, 1649 (f. 199ᵛ).

[7] *Reg. Congregn.* QA, f. 9ᵛ.

at least were qualified, but were probably away rent-gathering); in this context, let it be remembered that just a year later such a large foundation as New reported it had not enough M.A.'s to supply a sufficient number to carry on the affairs of the college according to statute.[1] The same Henry Eure was not in Oxford on Egg-Saturday (the Saturday before Ash Wednesday) to present himself at St. Mary's for his B.A. determination,[2] which might be explained by his being also away collecting £55 College revenue in Gloucestershire and elsewhere;[3] he was granted a dispensation to perform this exercise later; and with him are coupled the names of other men of Jesus who "determined" in the Lent of 1649.[4] At first sight the supplicat of Lewis Williams of Merioneth (he who changed his mind after refusing to submit to the Visitors) that he should be admitted to the degree of M.A. at the end of May, 1649, although he had been away from Oxford and so could not observe the regulations necessary for that degree under the existing statutes, seems to give material support to the Principal's revelations; and the addendum that he had been detained in the country on serious business looks like being the Registrar's refined way of saying that the society of Jesus had for a time broken up. But when the same entry goes on to state that this absence of Williams' was granted by a vote "in Domo Convocationis," when one also remembers that he had been away for three terms and that exigencies of time practically restrict the alleged dissolution at Jesus to the one term of Hilary, 1649, then it follows that the serious business (*seriis negotiis*) which detained him for three terms and was to detain him again from appearing at the Act some weeks later must be accounted for otherwise than by internal commotions at Jesus.[5] The Principal's own

[1] Burrows: *Register*, pp. 290-291 (order of 2 April, 1650).

[2] For a full account of the terms presentation (or admission), determination, the importance of Egg-Saturday, etc., see Andrew Clark's *Reg. Univ. Oxon.*, vol. II, pt. i, 48-54. Presentation came *before* determination.

[3] Cp. *Reg. Congregn. QA*, f. 9ᵛ with *Bursary Book*, s.a. 1649, p. 176.

[4] *Ib.*, ff. 9ᵛ, 126. The name of John Forward is down on f. 126 opposite "1648," which means that he determined before or on 24 March, 1648-1649.

[5] *Reg. Congregn.* QA, ff. 6ᵛ, 8. It is very possible, nevertheless, that Williams' absence was not unconcerned with the troubles of the Visitation.

admission to the Doctorate of Divinity took place at the end of the aforesaid Hilary Term in 1649, "without Scio's" says Walker,[1] "sine Deponentibus," says the Register of Congregation, "quod pauci sunt Doctores in Vniversitate qui hoc officium praestare debent";[2] as this deficiency of deponents (they were the three full-fledged D.D.'s who could utter the oath or "Scio" as to the candidate's fitness[3]) affected other applicants than the Head of Jesus, it must not be pressed to his disadvantage as evidence that the dignified Puritan leaders desired little to do with a Principal who was a Principal in name only. Another entry on the same folio relative to the same degree puts it on record that he was dispensed from other formalities, Visitation and Circuit,[4] "quod instante fine termini aliam Congregationem sine suo incommodo ex[s]pectare non potest." Whatever this mysterious "incommodum" was, it must be admitted that the cumulative effect of the preceding considerations presses one to think that there was no appreciable break in College routine between his arrival in 1648 and that petition of 1649 in which he breaks to the Committee the news of the dissolution. But the eloquent lacunae on p. 180 of the Bursary Book—two or three Fellows, including Jonathan Roberts, not receiving any allowance at all in 1649—do they not testify that the Principal laid the Puritan articler and his possible associates under a mortmain? This conclusion again, seeing that all these names and sums of money were written in very pale red ink, is not free of danger; for it is just possible that Jonathan's dole was originally in paler ink, though not altogether invisible. At the same time it is more probable that the Principal, who had constituted himself Bursar for the time being, left his opponent to ruminate in comparative poverty over the charges he had brought against his chief and the untoward fate that overtook them at the hands of the London Committee. Dr. Michael Roberts was not likely to act the part of David.

Here it is proposed to insert a short paragraph dealing

[1] *Sufferings*, i, 143. col. 1. [2] *Reg. Congregn.* QA, f. 10'.

[3] Andrew Clark: *Reg. Univ. Oxon.*, vol. II, pt. i, p. 143. Roberts thus found himself in the happy position of not having to present gloves to the three deponents (*ib.*, p. 222).

[4] Clark: *Reg. Univ. Oxon.*, vol. II, pt. i, pp. 80-81 described under the M.A. regulations).

with other operations of the law of Necessity, and those more propitious for the harassed Principal. The importunities of Vavasor Powell and other chiefs of the Propagation in Wales, coupled with the satisfactory salary they dispensed (£60 per annum), prevailed upon Jonathan Roberts to leave Oxford in November, 1650 (if not before).[1] Nevertheless, he was back in Oxford for some time in 1651 to perform his final exercises for the degree of M.A.;[2] in the absence of any dispensation granted him by Congregation, which in his case would be worded "quod seriis negotiis rure detentus erat," it must be inferred that he was present in the University to undergo the Austin and Quodlibet disputations both essential for this degree.[3] The Act of July over, he seems then to have turned his back finally upon Oxford and devoted himself to evangelical work in North Wales. The name of Charles Edwards is significantly absent from the list of Scholars in 1649[4] (one account has it that he was ejected from the College and became married about this time[5]); it is certain he also was engaged by the aforesaid Commissioners in 1650 and for a like salary to Jonathan Roberts.[6] The Principal would be more than human if he were not heartily glad to see the backs of both of them. In another direction fortune favoured him by bringing into Jesus two brothers from Trinity College, Dublin, John Parry and Benjamin Parry, sons of Edward Parry, Bishop of Killaloe. If Dr. Michael's reminiscent words to Archbishop Sancroft in 1679 are deserving of full credence he exerted himself to make the brothers at home in Oxford by helping them forward with offices of emolument:[7] it is clear that John became Fellow about 1651;[8] as to Benjamin,

[1] Bodl. MS. Rawlinson. c. 261 [*Cymdeithas Llêu Cymru Reprint*, p. 27]—"time commencing 20 November last" It occurs among the minutes of the Wrexham meeting of the Propagation Commissioners held on *21 Nov., 1650.*

[2] *Reg. Congreyn.* QA, f. 186^{v}; "admitted" M.A., 18 June, 1651.

[3] For these (and other M.A. formalities) see Clark: *Reg. Univ. Oxon.*, vol. II, pt. i. 73—88.

[4] *Bursary Book*, s.a.

[5] J. C. Morrice: *Wales in the Seventeenth Century*, p 184.

[6] Bodl. Rawlinson MS. c. 261 [*Cymd. Llên Cymru Reprint*, p. 26].

[7] *Tanner MS.* 314, f. 21 (letter dated 23 Jan., 1678-1679).

[8] I can find no confirmation of Principal Hardy's statement that he was made Fellow in 1650 (*Jes. Coll.*, p. 124). He was not incorporated at Oxford before 18 March, 1650—1651 (*Alumni Oxon.*, iii, 1121); *Clark's Yearly Lists* class him "scholar" as late as 1652.

the words in the Register of Congregation describing him as "Scho. Ar. e coll. Jesu"[1] must not be taken to mean that he was Scholar of Jesus, but "scholaris artium" of the University (that is, an undergraduate in Arts on his way to become a graduate).[2] In reality, they were a new type of academic refugee, this time from Ireland, seeking asylum in England from the Spanish pestilence that ravaged that island and which had caused the temporary dissolution of Trinity College.[3] How well-flavoured with the blessed word "dissolution" must have been the talks of the three ex-Trinity men! Sometimes surely they would strike homelier notes; for the Parrys were descended from old Anglesey families in Llwydiarth and Llanfechell[4] and their sister Mary was married to one of the Bulkeleys of Gronant, a collateral branch of the Bulkeleys of Beaumaris.[5] Under their breaths they might refer to the Anglesey events of 1648, breaking up company with treason on their lips.

(vi) The Triumphs of Jenkin Lloyd.

Before this chapter is far advanced it will be abundantly clear that the transformation of two foundationers into propagators and the arrival of two half-terrified students from Ireland were hopelessly inadequate to still the troubled waters at Jesus. Matters of money had from the very beginning added new fuel to the fires of discontent. And if there was a modicum of truth in the Head's reference to a dissolution in 1649, it was much less likely to arise from the machinations of a junior Fellow than from lack of sustenance due to debt, a condition of affairs which

[1] *Q.A.* f. 20ᵛ.

[2] See Clark: *Reg. Univ. Oxon.*, vol. II, pt. i, p. 7 (n. 3). Parry is thus described as "scholaris" in a dispensation of Jan. 21, 1651—52; later in that term of Hilary he was "admitted" B.A. (cp. *QA*, ff. 20ᵛ, 200ᵛ).

[3] R. Dunlop: *Ireland under the Commonwealth*, i, Doct. 7, pp. 10—11 (for reference to plague, p. 10 (n. 3)). The *Alumni Oxon.* (iii, 1119) says Benj. Parry matriculated on 20 March, 1650—1651; but *Liber Matric.*, W. f. 457, has a "Benjaminus Parry" paying his admission fees on *7 Dec., 1650.* If the latter is our Benjamin—and he is "ministri filius"—then it is possible that he had come to Jesus *before* the outbreak of the plague in Dublin.

[4] J. E. Griffith: *Pedigrees of Angl. and Carn. Families* (1914), p. 120.

[5] *Ib.*, p. 121; N.L.W. MS., 1511E, f. 47ᵃ.

did really and truly lead to a break-up at University College within a few months afterwards.[1] Right at the commencement of the new dispensation at Jesus dues outstanding amounted to £1,345 15s. 11d. and the excess of disbursements over received rents was no less than £451 14s. 9d.[2] Of course, all the colleges alike suffered from financial stringency, mainly because of the disorganisation of the landed interest caused by the war and the withholding of rents by disaffected Cavalier tenants;[3] in the case of Jesus and on account of the rumours concerning the new Principal, it is quite possible that Puritan holders of College lands felt indisposed to oil the wheels of a quasi-Anglican machine. As an example of the former, the rent charge of Maenclochog in Pembroke, amounting to £10 a year and bequeathed to the College in 1622 by Sir Thomas Canon, was not paid for four years by his son Maurice. The authority of the law was evoked in 1650, and the £40 was collected by Jenkin Lloyd.[4] It was not to be expected that the Cavalier Canon would pay his dues very promptly seeing that one moiety of his father's bequest was to be given for a lecture on the Anglican catechism and the other for a sermon in the College chapel on the Thursday before the Act of July to be preached by one of the College divines.[5] How was it possible to have these conditions observed under the Puritan Visitors? There is not much doubt that Canon was the refractory College tenant whose case was taken by Roberts before the House of Convocation (or rather before the delegates "pro negotiis publicis") on 11 September, 1649, and drew from them the opinion that the London Committee for Regulation should have the ordering of all cases of this nature.[6] Older debts still, and in a different

[1] Burrows: *Register*, pp. 289-290, 329-330.

[2] Summary of accounts (1644-1648) given in by Mansell in 1649 (Hardy: *Jesus College*, p. 113). The amount given at the bottom of that page should read £894 1s 2d., and not £896 1s. 2d. (difference between dues and actual disbursements).

[3] Even in 1643 Principal Mansell had written of sums due from good friends of the College—"by reason of the bad condition of the times not any of these were payd" (Hardy: *Jesus College*, p. 93).

[4] *Bursary Book*, sub anno, p. 192.

[5] Hardy: *Jesus College*, pp. 71-72.

[6] *Reg. Convocn. T*, p. 72. They wanted a petition sent to Parliament to that effect. For a fuller reference to these delegates, see paragraphs at the end of this chapter.

category, were outstanding, such as the money due from Lady Grandison for bread and beer supplied her when nursing her dying husband in 1643.[1] Altogether she owed the College £24 13s. 4d. Roberts had to make a journey to Bedfordshire and thence to London in quest of her and the debt; all we know for certain is that the journey cost him and the College £3.[2] If Mansell had failed to secure satisfaction, small chance had Roberts, and how piquant the interview must have been!

These journeys more than suggest that the new Principal tried a way of his own to solve difficulties of administration. For the first two years no Bursar was appointed, the Bursary Book under 1649 putting in a parenthesis "there beeing no Bursar then"; as already remarked, the important work of rent-collecting fell to the lot of the Fellows, chiefly Lloyd, Vaughan and the Englishmen (it is not recorded in writing whether they enjoyed their peregrinations or no);[3] how money went out is shown by one of the Fellows, Henry Eure, receiving £2 for a carriage to London and back, and by a certain Thomas Evans receiving £6 for bringing in the rent charge of Sir Humphrey Tracey from the Gloucestershire interests of the College.[4] Moreover, in addition to the Grandison journey, the Principal himself made frequent journeys to the country on College business, the expenses of which he expected to get paid out of the College chest; as far as the accounts go, one is left to wonder whether his journeys to London and his prolonged absence there answering articles of delinquency were laid to the charge of the foundation. Before plunging into the vortex of controversy, it is refreshing to read that the Principal gave a parting gift of £6 to Edmund Garnett (probably an old servant of the College) and that, wonderful to relate, by the consent of the Fellows;[5] as to the levy assessed upon the College to help defraying the expenses of a University lawsuit with the city, Convocation at the end of 1649 precluded unseemly bickering by asking the Head to pay 5s., each of the Fellows 1s. 3d., each of the Scholars

[1] He died at Jesus in Sept., 1643, from wounds received at the siege of Bristol. [2] Hardy: *Jesus College*, p. 105.
[3] *Sub anno* 1649 (*Bursary Book*, pp. 176-180). This is in the Principal's own handwriting. [4] *Sub anno* 1650 (*Bursary Book*, p. 206).
[5] *Ibid.* (*Bursary Book*, p. 200).

8d.[1] But these, after all, were small points. As to the weightier questions of the Bursarship and the expensive journeys, is it probable (calling to mind the flashes of lightning that lit up the atmosphere of the Welsh College) these proceedings of the Principal would pass unchallenged? Why should some ambitious Fellow not have the office and why should not another have the post of Vice-Principal, which as late as 1652 seems to have been left unfilled?[2] Why should the Bursary Books be silent about allowances to Scholars both in 1649 and 1650?[3] Why should the Principal take it upon himself to fulfil the terms of Lady Walters' bequest by preaching on the Sabbath at Wolvercote when it was the custom before and after his time to assign this duty to one of the Fellows?[4] To be brutally short, why should the attenuated College revenue be eaten up by the Principal? Echo answers why. But in the name of common sense what was Roberts to do if his allowance as Head of Jesus only amounted to £40 a year, a salary enjoyed by the master of a Puritan free school like Wrexham under the Propagation Act?[5] Unfortunately for this particular argument, the Visitors had as early as 14 July, 1649, sent an order to several of the poorer colleges asking for the exact value of their Headships;[6] returns were made, including that of the Jesus £40, by the 26th;[7] these were forwarded to the London Committee for the Regulation of the two Universities, who had £2,000 allocated to them by an ordinance of Parliament passed in June, 1649, "for y^e^ increase of the maintenance of the Masterships of such colledges in both Universities of this Nation as have not a sufficient maintenance";[8] and on 26 September, 1650, that Committee ordered the Trustees for Maintenance of Ministers (the actual paying body under the ordinance of 1649) to pay the Principal of Jesus the yearly sum of £92, to be issued quarterly by equal portions "accompted from the

[1] *Reg. Convocn. T*, pp. 88—89 (*sub* 12 Dec., 1649); *Life and Times* iv, 61 (extracts from the Vice-Chancellor's Computi).

[2] *Clark's Yearly Lists*, sub anno 1652; space opposite V.P. vacant.

[3] *Sub annis*, pp. 180, 202.

[4] Hardy: *Jesus College*, pp. 93-94.

[5] *H.P.M.*, p. 226.

[6] Burrows: *Register*, p. 246.

[7] *Ib.*, p. 251; cp. *Wood MS.* F. 35, f. 261.

[8] Firth and Rait: *Acts and Ordinances*, ii, 142—148; summarised by Dr. W. A. Shaw: *Hist. Eng. Church*, ii, 214—216.

21 of June last."[1] Of this new development in the fortunes of the Principal we may rest assured the Fellows were very well aware. The orders preserved at Sion College do not say a word that such Principals as received these augmentations were to sacrifice *other* emoluments which they might have enjoyed in conjunction with their Headships, but Professor Burrows quotes from a petition of 1654 sent to the Protector by ten Heads of Houses (Jesus coming ninth) for a more punctual payment of increases similar to the above in which the inference is very clear that such was, if not a written inhibition, an unwritten understanding.[2] Another excellent argument for the Fellows! Again, though the actual award of the £92 augmentation was made in September, 1650, the purpose of Parliament had been revealed more than 15 months before; and even if the benefaction had never been intended at all, it is not likely that the Fellows (be they intruded Puritans or Anglican submitters) would have let their statutable privileges be usurped without a struggle, and a tough one at that.

The ball was started in July, 1650, when Roberts seems to have made an effort to neutralise the Fellows' attack by submitting proposals of his own to the Visitors, since the latter, on the 29th July, inform the London Committee of their intention to discuss them at their next meeting.[3] By that meeting, two days later, the Fellows had unspecified articles of charge levelled against their Principal; and the Visitors could not but order a copy of the same to be supplied him, adding that they would be glad of his answer at the meeting next to follow.[4] Whether the session of 8 August was that next meeting or no, whether the presiding panel had had the answer called for or no, on that date they came to two very serious decisions: first, that by the 19 August the Principal was to bring clearly stated all his accounts of receipts and disbursements "which hath properly appertayned to the said Colledge since his executing the place of Principall untill this day"; second, because of the great neglect there had been in choosing officers to maintain the proper government of the said College, the Principal and Fellows were

[1] *Sion College MS.* marked A.R.C., $L\frac{40}{2}$, E. 16, ff. 390-391.
[2] Burrows: *Register*, Introd., cx, note *a*.
[3] *Ib.*, p. 299. [4] *Ib.*, p. 300.

directed to consult and elect all such officers as were thought fit and necessary no later than the following day (9 August) in the afternoon—such officers, too, to be maintained according to the statutes and customs of the House.[1] The two decisions, taken together, reveal pretty clearly what the Fellows' charges amounted to. The meeting on 9 August in the afternoon did take place as ordered, and proved (as all would know) a tumultuous one; be it remembered, assuming that our interpretation of the entry on the Rawlinson MS. is correct,[2] that Jonathan Roberts had not yet left the College to join forces with the Propagators. "Differences arose during the election between the Principal and the Fellows" are the euphuistic words of the Visitors' registrar, to which body the aforesaid differences were brought for adjustment five days later. They decided that the elections made by the Fellows were to stand. And it arouses not the slightest surprise that that bland tactician Jenkin Lloyd of Llandyssul secured for himself the resurrected Bursarship—no mean triumph in face of the undisguised hostility of the Principal and surrounded by a compact group of English Fellows (not yet departed), who were sufficient in numbers to carry it for one of themselves.[3] Lloyd went further and prevailed upon the Visitors to grant him an assistant, indispensable adjunct to a man who six months before had been named one of the 25 "approvers" under the Propagation Act[4] and a fortnight after that one of the "trustees" for confiscated Irish lands whose revenues were meant to advance Protestant education in that country.[5] Unfortunately, one is left with the conviction that the August elections had only transferred the Bursarship from a Principal who had no business to hold it to a Fellow who had no time to devote to it. Let it be said, however, that for the year ending 16 August, 1650, Lloyd had managed to gather £117 of the College rents,[6] which in turn was very probably used by him and his

[1] Burrows: *Register*, pp. 302-303.
[2] *Supra*, p. 44 (n. 1).
[3] Burrows: *Register*, p. 306.
[4] 22 Feb., 1649-1650 (*H.P.M.*, p. 85).
[5] 8 March, 1649-1650 (Firth and Rait: *Acts and Ordinances*, ii, 355-356).
[6] *Bursary Book*, *sub anno* 1650, p. 198. Vaughan had collected £107 0s. 7d.

friends as a strong argument for obtaining the official Bursarship. One item in this total, a sum of £14 due from the College lands in Llangynhafal, Nannerch and Ysceifiog which were "farmed" by the relict of Dr. Richard Lloyd, deserves more than a passing notice.[1] Dr. Richard Lloyd was the Merioneth man who was vicar of Ruabon until his death and happened to be father of that Humphrey Lloyd, Fellow of Oriel, who (it will bear repeating) was imprisoned in 1642, and dispossessed both of that Fellowship and afterwards (16 July, 1650) of the vicariate of Ruabon in which he had succeeded his father in 1647. Assuming an interview between two men who were about the greatest Mammonites of their generation in Wales and both dowered by a kind (or unkind) Providence with a wealth of craft,[2] assuming also they met after that fateful day of July, it would be a genuine case of Greek meeting Greek. One feels quite convinced that the prosaic words of the Bursary Book cover a virile little drama. The securing of that £14 was a triumph in itself and well worthy of the Bursarship.[3]

References to rents remind us that the Principal was to present his accounts on the 19th August. At this point the Register falls mysteriously silent over Jesus affairs: there is no record of a meeting on the 19th as arranged or of any presentation of accounts within that year (unless, indeed, pp. 176-206 of the Bursary Book be said to represent the Principal's attempt at a "clear statement" of the Jesus budget for 1649 and 1650 up to August 16th). The next entry of importance figuring in the Register is a missive from the London Committee, dated 14 November, ordering the Visitors to see to it that all Heads were to reside permanently in their Colleges or Halls and attend to their charge, significant omen that the Visitors had outlined to the London regulators the sins of the Principal of Jesus or that the Fellows' voices, notably the still

[1] *Bursary Book*, p. 194.

[2] Should anyone be inclined to disbelieve in Humphrey Lloyd's gifts for controversy, he is invited to study the details of the Whitford lease case (see docts. in Dolben Papers, *MSS. Bodl. Add. C. 304a*) and those of the Llandinam annexation (pungent letters interchanged between him and Archbp. Sancroft, preserved in *Tanner MS.* 146).

[3] Lloyd had in the previous year collected £6 arrears of rent from the same source (*Bursary Book*, p. 176).

small voice of Jenkin Lloyd, had reached headquarters.[1] And the expenses question, notwithstanding the August elections and the aforesaid silence of the Register, was only smouldering, for it flared up anew in 1651; on 27 March in that year the Visitors have to listen to the wearisome iteration of the old arguments between the Principal and Fellows arising from demands made by the former for payment of monies expended on College business and of salaries for some offices in the House (held, presumably, *before* the August reconstruction). At the end the Visitors tipped the balance rather heavily on the side of the Fellows: for journeys made on College business and which were excepted against, the Principal was only to have £40 allowed him (it is evident he had presented a much larger bill); as to offices held in the House by him, such were to be, in the Visitors' phrase, "cut off wholly"; as to the "lecture" at Wolvercote, they decided he was only to have the sum specified in the will of the founder proportionately "for the tyme he hath taken paines in it."[2] Thus far, since his arrival in 1648, Michael Roberts had swept aside the Puritan onslaught upon his just character as a Puritan so successfully that, judging by the actual records, neither Visitor nor Fellow uttered a syllable to his discredit on this point as long as he remained Head of Jesus; against the re-arranged attack upon his methods of administration he had failed and failed badly, chiefly because the craft and cunning of Jenkin Lloyd had been substituted for the frontal attack of Jonathan Roberts.

However, though Lloyd and the dominant party had sent Roberts to the floor, he had not been counted out (we offer no apology for using the phrases of the ring); the refereeing Visitors did not see sufficient cause to remove him; and right up to the end they were determined to give the unfortunate Head they had chosen in 1648 every fair play. There was no suspicion of ostracism by the supreme authorities, whatever charges crowded on his head; he was allowed a very fair share of University re-

[1] Burrows: *Register*, p. 309. In a note at the foot of this page the Editor has something to say of John Palmer, the Puritan Warden of All Souls, who was a member of the Rump. He makes no reference to Roberts, who was much more likely to have been the occasion of the Committee's order.

[2] Burrows: *Register*, p. 332.

sponsibility, poor as might be the opinion harboured of him by the inmates of his own College. Even at the risk of digression, due emphasis must be laid on these considerations: on 4 April, 1649, two days before he entered upon his Doctorate, Roberts was appointed one of the important delegates "pro negotiis publicis,"[1] described by Wood as an academic body who "acted and framed all things before they came up to Convocation";[2] on 13 August, less than a month after he had been cleared from articles of delinquency, he finds himself appointed one of the assistant delegates to the Visitors themselves (the post once held by Vice-Principal Adams) to act as a "spy" upon any Anglican proclivities in the College;[3] on 2 June, 1651, he was also elected one of the sub-delegates of Convocation to examine the statutes of the University with the idea of assimilating them to the prevailing Puritan standards.[4] And about a month after that, just three months after his serious rebuff on the expenses question, the Principal of Jesus took a prominent part "in Vesperiis et Comitiis" (corresponding to the modern "Encaenia" or "Commemoration"), presiding as one of the moderators, and propounding "quaestiones discutiendae" to the inceptor M.A.'s in the nave of St. Mary's Church.[5] These disputations of the Act,[6] as they were often called, were interesting enough and at this period rigidly insisted upon; what made those of 1651 the more piquant lay in the possibility of Roberts engaging in academic debate with two of his own Fellows, Laurence Jones and Jonathan Roberts, both formally "admitted" M.A.'s three

[1] *Reg. Convocn. T*, p. 40. It is very clear that these particular "delegates" were quite a powerful body. Not only Heads, but Fellows of Colleges, were eligible to be of their number, as proved by James Vaughan, Thomas Ellis, and Laurence Jones acting as such at various times concurrently with the Principal.

[2] *Life and Times*, i, 328.

[3] Burrows: *Register*, p. 260 (cp. pp. 3-4). It is Walker who calls these delegates "spies and informers" (*Suffs.*, i, 129), terms rather vigorously objected to by G. B. Tatham (*Puritans in Power*, pp. 173-174).

[4] *Reg. Convocn. T*, p. 141; cp. *Life and Times*, i, 155.

[5] *Reg. Congregn.* QA, f. 150. See Clark's *Reg. Univ. Oxon.*, vol. II, pt. i, 82-85, for further light on the academic terms used in the text.

[6] The "Act" refers to the Comitia only; strictly speaking, it did not include the "Vesperies" held on the Saturday previous.

weeks before and now proceeding through the final stage of their degree as inceptors in Arts.[1] Should this possibility develop into actual fact, it would be well worth hearing how Jonathan Roberts argued that "reformatores" *were* "novatores" in opposition to the moderator's negative.[2] Would the rules of Logic allow the Fellow to say that he knew a reforming Principal who a few months previously had been found guilty of introducing heinous innovations into the government of a certain College? Perhaps a common-sense view will dismiss these possibilities as idle fancies : it is probable there was an academic veto on moderators disputing with members of their own colleges ; and it must be admitted (the Register of Congregation leaves the matter open) that the wording of the "quaestiones" sounds more appropriate to the School of Theology than the Faculty of Arts. Whichever of the two faculties it was, we have Clark's high authority for the statement that the tedium of the Comitia was often relieved by loud bursts of laughter arising from the philosophical by-play of daring inceptors and responding moderators.[3] Now not only did it happen that indulgence in indiscriminate witticisms was one of Michael's besetting sins, but it also happened that the one Act—this of 1651—in which the Principal of Jesus took a leading part proved one of the most uproarious in the history of the University : the air was filled with "hummings and other clamorous noises,"[4] and the Dean of Christ Church (Dr. John Owen) was so incensed at the profane speech of the University wit elected for the occasion (the "terrae filius" of ancient custom) that he went up to the rostrum in person and pulled him down by force.[5]

At this point a descent must be made from the pictur-

[1] *Reg. Congregn.* QA, f. 186^{v} (admitted to degree of M.A. on 18 June, 1651) ; both names occur among the "nomina incipientium in Comitiis" for that year (*ib.*, f. 117).

[2] The three "quaestiones" are appended :—

a An Justificatio sit distincta a sanctificatione? [Roberts in affirmative].

b An Reformatores sint Novatores? [Roberts in negative].

c An Lectio Scripturarum sint plebi permittenda? [Roberts in affirmative].

[3] *Reg. Univ. Oxon.*, vol. II, pt. i, 83-84.

[4] This is an inference from the orders on 5 July, 1652, issued just before the Act of the following year (*Life and Times*, i, 175).

[5] Burrows : *Register*, Introd., xli.

esque ceremonial of the Act to the dreary plane of College business. It would be in the highest degree ungenerous, with the evidence at our command, to associate the indecorousness of the Act of 1651 with the person and presence of Roberts; for the disorganisation at Jesus and the parlous state of its finances he, when all is said, must be held to a great extent responsible. No honours bestowed upon him served to bring more money into the College coffers. This year 1651 saw no great improvement, coming though it did after the new arrangements inaugurated in 1650 and falling within the dispensation of the persuasive new Bursar. As proof of this and taking advantage of the College statute "de diminuendo," the Visitors gave leave to the Principal and Fellows to diminish the number of Fellows and Scholars as places should hereafter fall void; the statutable allowances of the present number, they said, were far above the proportion of means then enjoyed by the College. At the same meeting they let it be known that some effective course must be devised to gather in detained revenues without the charge of suits at law, "being the College is not able to undergo such a burden."[1] Two Cavalier colonels in Cardiganshire (James Lewis and Thomas Lloyd) were keeping in their hands £40 of College rents accruing from that county and that of Pembroke; the fact that one of them had paid his quota in 1650[2] points to this dereliction as a fruit of the Cardiganshire uprising of 1651 which culminated in the surrender at Llanbadarn.[3] Nor did ex-Principal Mansell at this time quite bear out the eulogistic words of Sir Leoline Jenkins, as he was detaining £60 of College revenue derived from Carmarthen and Glamorgan.[4] All this assuredly pointed to a sad state of affairs, but not sadder than the condition of Balliol and University; did not Wadham in 1650 owe over £400 to brewers, bakers, and other tradesmen of the city?[5] In any case, assuming that Jesus had seen one dissolution in 1649, the Visitors had no desire to see another in 1652.

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 346.
[2] *Bursary Book*, s.a., p. 192.
[3] *Tanner MS.* 54, ff. 90, 99 (letters from Rowland Dawkins to Philip Jones and from Jones to Fleetwood—June, 1651).
[4] Burrows: *Register*, p. 346.
[5] *Ibid.*, pp. 288, 289-290, 294, 301, 329-330.

(vii) Desperate Remedies.

These counsels of restraint by the Visitors were dated 16 February in 1652, and for a time the utter silence both of the Visitors' Register and of the Jesus records themselves (save for some casual and inconsequent jottings) make us enter a darksome tunnel only occasionally relieved by a ray of light. One of these comes from the Register of Congregation, conveying the good news that four Jesus men were admitted B.A.'s in 1652 and nine in 1653, besides two to the degree of M.A. in the latter year (one of them being the elder of the two Dublin brothers).[1] And notwithstanding the meagreness of documents, events of great import are seen dimly developing into shape and purpose. The first Presbyterian panel of Visitors, controlling the double engine of ejectment and election, was superseded in April, 1652, by a more Independent board, to be itself followed in 1654 by a third body in which Goodwin of Magdalen and Conant of Exeter were the more powerful personalities;[2] the London Committee for Regulation, which had often directed the first panel and revised its orders, died its death just a week after it, allowing the second and third boards autonomous jurisdiction in the University;[3] as to Jesus itself, in 1652-1653 a gradual change of personnel came over its administration. Most of the Englishmen departed in search of better Fellowships elsewhere, and Jenkin Lloyd had been summoned to enjoy a wider scope for his nimble mind in other spheres of activity.[4] An entry in the Register opposite 1 April, 1652, is usually represented as meaning that Samuel Jones was promoted from Scholar to Fellow on that date,[5] only it is somewhat mysterious to find his name in the Buttery Book as "Scholar" up to the end of the year.[6] At what stage his transition from a non-submitter of Merton to the later Puritan minister had arrived in 1652 it is impossible to gauge; even if his Puritanism had developed apace, sure it was that only he and

[1] *QA*, ff. 187, 200v-201r. [2] Burrows: *Register*, Introd., lxxvii-lxxix.
[3] Dr. W. A. Shaw: *Hist. Eng. Church*, II, p. 219.
[4] Firth and Rait: *Acts and Ordinances*, ii, 977, 1085, 1324, 1382; W. R. Williams: *Hist. Parly. Repn. Wales*, p. 30 (some of the references on this page almost lead one to think there were more than one Jenkin Lloyd figuring at this period).
[5] Burrows: *Register*, p. 177. [6] *Clark's Yearly Lists*, sub anno.

Laurence Jones (still remaining Fellow and so to remain until and after 1660) had any real pretensions to that faith. Thomas Ellis of Dolbenmaen, once expelled and afterwards admitted to mercy, was made Censor of the College; Lewis Williams of Hafodgaregog, a gentleman in the same category, became Bursar in place of Jenkin Lloyd; James Vaughan, the old submitting Fellow and discharged delinquent, naturally filled the vacant post of Vice-Principal. The exact date of these promotions is problematic; it is known that certain accounts for "juggs" submitted on 6 August, 1653, were subscribed by all three in their new capacities, although the official designation of Vaughan is practically illegible in the Bursary Book.[1] Both Ellis and Vaughan (in company with the Principal) acted as Jesus delegates "pro negotiis publicis" in the years 1653-1654,[2] and Ellis attended at least two meetings on the same dates as his chief.[3] It looked indeed as if malignants were coming to their own again, and one is tempted to think that Roberts would soon be surrounded by a congenial company of men with a past. But such a theory would be at hopeless variance with the real facts of the situation. To Jonathan Roberts the Principal was a hypocrite to be exposed by blunt articles; the opportunist Jenkin Lloyd was satisfied with winning success for an alternative policy by a system of tactics; to Ellis and Williams and Vaughan, Anglican submitters all three though they were, the Head was a Royalist renegade, and nothing would suffice but a war to the death, with the Principal's body thrown over the ramparts (bloodthirsty metaphors, but apposite to the atmosphere). The Buttery Books seem to show that Ellis had been elected Fellow in 1649 and Williams in 1650;[4] that being so, it is a conjecture free from hazard that they would outvie even Jonathan Roberts in supporting the candidature of Jenkin Lloyd for the Bursarship in August of the latter year.

As if these were not sufficient elements for drama, the Buttery Books testify that more are to follow. In other words, some explanation must be given of the unexpected

[1] *Sub anno* 1653, p. 208.
[2] *Reg. Convocn. T*, pp. 160, 179, 181, 223 and passim.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 226 (11 Nov., 1653); 254 (18 Nov., 1654).
[4] *Clark's Yearly Lists*, sub anno 1652.

names of two "noblemen" who figure as group IV in Clark's Yearly Lists for 1652. The Visitors of the first panel must have remembered the almost universal regret which had attended Francis Mansell's dispossession, for at the beginning of 1652 the old Principal was allowed to return (he must have been there when inquiries were set on foot about the £60 rents detained by him) merely as a private member and given one chamber to accommodate himself, says his biographer, "near the Stoney Staires by the Gate." "There," continues the same writer, "he had leisure to observe many changes and revolutions within those walls as without them till that happy one of his Majestie's Restauration."[1] His exercise within doors was prayer, without doors charity and attendance at clandestine services of the Church of England; his name is never mentioned in connection with the troubles of the College, says Professor Burrows.[2] Must we really believe all this about Mansell's Spartan silence, the Mansell who had himself at his own election in 1620 disfranchised the Fellows who opposed him and in 1637-1638 closed all avenues of return to Roberts?[3] Did he content himself with *observing* changes and revolutions? Jesus had also the society, for a great part of the year 1652, of a still more distinguished man, confidant of Charles I and admired of Cromwell, profoundly skilled in controversy, a defender of the Church and architect of moderate reform —Dr. James Ussher, retired Archbishop of Armagh in Ireland.[4] The very presence of such men in the College, even if no word was said by them, would act as a powerful solvent of whatever influence the acting Principal may have had. At some time in the year 1653[5] the Fellows had a new accession in the person of Hamlet Puleston, a Wadham non-submitter who afterwards submitted, native of Hampshire and made Fellow of Jesus through the influence (most probably) of his uncle Judge John Puleston of Emral in Flintshire, better known to fame as the

[1] Quoted in Hardy: *Jesus College*, pp. 121-122.

[2] *Register*, Introd., cxvii.

[3] Clark: *Reg. Univ. Oxon.*, vol. II, pt. i, 291-293; *supra*, p. 22.

[4] There is no reference to his stay at Jesus by Alexander Gordon in *Dict. Nat. Biog.* (lviii, 68-69).

[5] Foster dates his Fellowship from 1656 (*Alumni Oxon.*, iii, 1219); but on more grounds than one it is safer to adopt Principal Hardy's suggestion (*Jesus College*, App. III, 240).

patron of Philip Henry at Worthenbury.[1] Hamlet is included as a Scholar of Jesus in 1652 and proceeded to his M.A. degree from that College in 1653.[2] He can with the greater safety be described as a Presbyterian who brought much-needed succour to the Puritan forces; and it is well for his reputation as a peaceful Presbyterian that he was only "accidentily" present in the lodgings of an irascible Fellow of Lincoln when the latter had to be forcibly ejected by the King's soldiers in 1660.[3] Wood condescends to say that Puleston was a preacher of some note;[4] because of his surrender to the Visitors, Walker is disinclined to take any further interest in him.[5]

What of Principal Roberts all this time, amidst the contempt of the dominant Anglicans, unrespected by the trio of Puritans (Puleston and the two Joneses), with two private Anglicans of the highest reputation pointing silent contrasts from their chambers, and with the masterful Heads of Christ Church and Exeter composing the differences of greater Houses with conspicuous success? Quite unregenerate, as will appear from the new charges which were gradually being built up against him. And practically friendless at that. Out of all the Fellows one can only think of John Parry of Dublin as likely to stand by his side; even that likelihood has to rest on the sentimental attachment of old Trinity men and on Roberts' insistence in after years on the kindness he had shown him during his exile from Ireland. The same arguments must suffice for the attitude of the younger brother. May it also be added that it would be dangerous for two gentlemen whose own father in 1628 had broken a Trinity statute by attempting to hold a cure of souls concurrently with his Fellowship to grumble too loudly about the greed and selfishness of the Principal?[6] Again, if Thomas Davies—student and Scholar of the College, son of a clergyman and probably a native of Anglesey[7]—is to be

[1] *Liber Matric. PP*, f. 261, adm. to Wadham on 24 May, 1647; Burrows: *Register*, pp. 87, 93; Philip Henry: *Diaries*, p. 29 (Letter of Lady Puleston to Francis Palmer of Christ Church, dated 19 Sept., 1653).

[2] *Clark's Yearly Lists* (1652); *Reg. Congregn.* QA, 31[v], 79[v], 187 (adm. 25 April).

[3] *Life and Times*, i, 333-334, sub 22 Sept., 1660.

[4] *Athenae Oxon.* (1692) ii, 177.

[5] *Sufferings*, ii, 137.

[6] J. P. Mahaffy: *An Epoch in Irish History* (1903 ed.), pp. 199-200.

[7] *Clark's Yearly Lists* (1652).

equated with the Llanarmon parson of that name who benefited by the ex-Principal's will 24 years later,[1] then it is natural to infer they must have held each other in some esteem while Principal and pupil;[2] and if the personal servant John Roberts of 1649 and the "servitor" of that name who witnessed his will in 1678 and was to benefit by it to the sum of £40 be one and the same person,[3] there were here long years of close association which must not be disregarded in the final judgement on the Doctor's character. But assumptions of this kind do not even rise to the dignity of silver linings. Much more seriously significant was it that at the beginning of 1654 the Dolbenmaen Anglican Thomas Ellis was appointed by Convocation a sub-delegate to inquire into the expenses of University administration[4]—surely an excellent training in applying the microscope to the minutiæ of Jesus finance. The clouds were sullenly gathering for the greatest storm of all.

With its triangle and even parallelogram of forces this last struggle is, if the spectators can forget its poignancy and pettiness, exceedingly pretty to watch. It began before the second panel of Visitors, whose surviving records are so scanty as to contain no mention of the important meeting of 22 May, 1654—we only know of it through a retrospective account in the minutes of the third panel[5] —in which the Fellows (re-arranged once more with Laurence Jones as Bursar instead of Lewis Williams, and now including Thomas Morgan of Cardiganshire,[6] the

[1] Llanarmon in Carnarvonshire. The will having left the name of the living blank had to be collated with *Tanner MS.* 35, f. 119—"Tom Davies, parson of Llanarmon." He is the only Thomas Davies I have met with in the records of the time.

[2] He was only to be richer by £3, however. For a copy of the will see Appendix A.

[3] I take the "Robin" of *Clark's Yearly Lists* (s.a. 1652) to be a *College* servant, and in any case not synonymous with John Roberts.

[4] *Reg. Convocn. T*, p. 234—appointed 26 Jan., 1653-1654. It is not very clear whether these "sub-delegates" were nominated by the delegates "pro negotiis" or by Convocation itself.

[5] Sub 30 Jan., 1654-1655 (Burrows: *Register*, p. 401).

[6] His exact attitude in the Jesus troubles, as well as his exact identity, are open to doubt. Here, as on p. 15, n. 1, it is hoped that Prof. Burrows' account on p. 503 is the true one. The *Alumni Oxon.* (ii, 1031) contains two names who might claim the position: Principal Hardy (*Jesus College*, p. 240) does not commit himself.

submitting non-submitter of 1648) had scored a great victory. Not great enough, however, to move the Principal from his position as Head of the College. In all conscience, the situation was now frankly impossible; but the Visitors at their meeting of 8 August,[1] 1654, prefer to call it an "unsetled condition," airily regretting possible mischiefs or inconveniences that may ensue. It does not increase our respect for the second panel (albeit Drs. John Owen, Thomas Goodwin and John Conant were its chief members) that the best advice they can give is that the members, bellicose Principal and insurgent Fellows, should do their respective duties and act in their several places according to the statutes and customs of the College.[2] Presumably they were going to try the experiment of closing down the hatches on this pestilent band of warring Welshmen. The third panel was appointed on 2 September, 1654;[3] and towards the end of that year or the early days of 1655 the Fellows took a very daring step by appealing to the Earl of Pembroke, hereditary Visitor of the College according to ancient form, but unfortunately for the appellants, wielding an authority rendered obsolete by the Visitation ordinances of 1647. Pembroke thought otherwise; fired, evidently, by the eloquent diatribes of the Fellows, he summoned the Principal to appear before *him* on 1 February, 1654-1655, upon pain of expulsion, "to determine matters of differences between him and the Fellowes."[4] The Principal put in the inevitable counter by appealing to the properly-constituted Visitors. They at their meeting of 30th January, two days before the projected tribunal at Wilton, indite a severely polite letter to the hereditary Visitor in which they intimate that they have asked Roberts to appear before the Earl and take with him the clauses of the Visitors' commission of 1654 where their authority in such cases was defined. The Principal was to go thus

[1] Misprinted 'April' in Hardy's *Jesus College*, p. 118.

[2] Burrows: *Register*, p. 394.

[3] Burrows says (*Reg.*, Introd., lxxix) that these were appointed by Parliament in January, 1653-1654. No Parliament was then in session. The remark is also at variance with his own statement on p. 400. See also the ordinance of appointment in Shadwell's *Enactments*, iv, App. II, 287 et seq.

[4] Retrospective account in Burrows: *Register*, p. 401 (minutes of meeting of Visitors on 30 Jan., 1654-55).

armed "*as an excuse for him to appeare otherwise than as one who professeth a desire to give your Lordship all satisfaction.*"[1] The fifth Earl of Pembroke must have read and re-read this part of the letter; if his command of strong language was anything like that of his father's, the fourth earl and sometime Chancellor, the air around Wilton would have been heavily charged with sulphur.[2] The registrar of the Visitors, having thus put the Visitor completely out of action, goes on to record that his masters had decided to allow of Roberts' appeal to *them*; to order the Principal and Fellows to make their addresses to the proper Visitors on 6 February, at 2 p.m., at the lodgings of the Vice-Chancellor (Dr. John Owen) in Christ Church; in the meantime all other proceedings (such as the "ultra vires" conference with Pembroke) to be inhibited.[3] Silence falls on the Register opposite this 6th February; it is not unlikely that the obsessions of the University authorities with the Penruddock or Salisbury rising of that spring had something to do in diverting the attention of both inquisitors and inquisitees (Dr. John Owen is said at that crisis to have ridden along the High at the head of a troop of horse[4]) from the perennial problems of Jesus. Be that as it may, Dr. Michael Roberts had leisure during that spring or summer to write an "encomiastick" to be prefixed to the "Gemma Cambri" published in August, 1655, and written by Richard Jones, the vicar of Llanfair Caereinion ejected by the Propagation Commissioners.[5]

While the Principal is reaping the fruit of the tactical mistake committed by the Fellows of appealing to the obsolete powers of a *Visitor* rather than confiding in the justice of fully-equipped Cromwellian *Visitors*, it will be convenient at this stage (though the document which actually states them was drawn up at the beginning of 1656) to give an outline of the charges that hung over his

[1] Burrows: *Register*, p. 401.

[2] In the National Library of Wales there is a curious satire on the elder Pembroke's vigorous way of expressing himself (*Commonwealth Tracts*, No. 312).

[3] *Register*, pp. 401-402 (in the latter page the appeal of Roberts is quoted verbatim).

[4] *Dict. Nat. Biog.*, xlii, p. 425.

[5] "This can be examined on pp. [13-14] of the British Museum copy, signed "*Mi: Roberts, S.T.D., Coll: Jesu, Pr.*" As for Richard Jones, see *H.P.M.*, p. 119.

head in 1654 and 1655. They will be found to be the old charges brought up to date with new grievances turned with the old bias. There were the usual charges of keeping no accounts as Principal and the new accusations of tendering some accounts, false and unjust in several particulars, and of getting them surreptitiously registered; to the former plaint of endeavouring to diminish the statutable allowances of the Fellows and augmenting his own salary beyond statute was added that of misusing the "poor scholers" of the College by disposing of exhibitions contrary to the will and direction of the donors, and of refusing to be accountable for the batells of his pupils "for which hee had given in no Caution or other securitie"; the charges of 1651 were re-echoed in his putting the College to unnecessary and excessive charges in journeys and law-suits, while on the other hand he had been negligent in recovering the detained dues of the College, in letting leases expire "wthout looking after them," and in attempting underhand to let leases under the customary rates. Issue was vigorously joined with him over the rectory of Holyhead: had he not "subducted" the tithe-lambs of that impropriation and converted the same to his own private use?; had he not also refused to pass the lease, granted to the "farmers" of the rectory, under the College seal unless they paid him £5 (when the statutory charge was only 40s.)? Last of all there was a circumstantial accusation that he, having the College seal in his custody, did engage the College in a debt of £91 to Dr. du Moulin[1] (the money is alleged to be for the Principal's own use) and attempted to give another bond to Dr. John Wallis,[2] "who refused it." The articles of indictment were nine in number, but the actual charges outlined were nearly double that.[3] A goodly array—how far were they true? As the account books covering the all-important period from 1653 to 1657 cannot be discovered either at the Library of Jesus or the Bursary, the present writer is able to effect a retreat from this problem with some show of grace, and to content himself with random shots.

[1] Lewis du Moulin, appointed Reader in Ancient History on 14 Sept., 1648 (Burrows: *Register*, p. 186).

[2] Savilian Professor of Geometry and a celebrated mathematician.

[3] *Wynne MS.* 239, f. 578. The self-same charges have been inserted in William Wynne's *Life of Sir Leoline Jenkins* (1724), i, p. viii.

Take the serious charge against the Principal of letting leases under the rates then obtaining. The renewal in 1649 to William Drinkwater of a lease on messuages held by him in Lad Lane (Old Jewry), interests which supplied the endowment of the Channel Islands fellowships, cannot be urged against him, since it was witnessed by the Vice-Chancellor, by the Senior Proctor for the time being, and by James Vaughan, acting "loco M^ri Roberts Principalis."[1] And the Bursary Book places on record the payment of £24 by the aforesaid Drinkwater as part fine for the renewal.[2] However, it is important to remember that this transaction had to suffer the full light of day, because the lease affected not only Jesus but Exeter and Pembroke as well, and the University seal had to be attached to it. As to the Holyhead delinquencies, the All Souls MSS. contain very conclusive testimony that after the Restoration the new administrators of Jesus did not want a single penny of that College revenue to go astray: they keep Lewis Coytmore, the new rector of Llangadwaladr or Eglwysael very busy as agent in sending in full accounts of the same.[3] But it is not safe to argue that Sir Leoline's strictness in 1670 proved misappropriation on Dr. Michael's part fifteen years before. To this comes the obvious retort that a Roberts shepherded into probity by University officials in 1649 might not be proof against uncircumscribed avarice in 1654 or 1655. Where there was so much smoke there must have been considerable fire. If but a fraction of the Fellows' indictment was true, it shows on the Principal's part a stubborn daring in overstraining the prerogatives of his high office, especially as he had been severely castigated by the Visitors of 1651 and of 1654 for offences not dissimilar; whether true or no, the Fellows displayed a meticulous exhaustiveness in cataloguing human frailty which brings to mind Wood's general strictures on the Fellows of the interregnum—"false, factious in College, delighting in petty plots and

[1] *Reg. Convocn. T.* pp. 66, 133 (long indentures dated 31 Aug. and 24 Dec., 1649). Very much the same argument would apply to the Medmenham indenture inserted on p. 182 of the same Register.

[2] *s. a.* 1649, p. 176 (there is another reference on p. 198).

[3] *Wynne MS.* 240, ff. 512-513, 514-515, 516-516^v. Coytmore was instituted to Llangadwaladr on 11 Sept., 1669 (*First Fruits Certificates*, Bangor, File 2).

raising in bason of water."[1] Petty the Jesus Fellows might have been, but they were practically unanimous. The articles in the Wynne MS. are subscribed by the trimming Vice-Principal as well as by Hamlet Puleston, the Presbyterian immigrant from Wadham; by Thomas Ellis the Anglican censor, together with Laurence Jones, the Puritan intruder from Magdalen Hall: the name of Lewis Williams, "inexsaturabile pectus," is sandwiched between the two. Different schools of religious and political thought had joined in a relentless bond against the Principal.

As has been already said, and as far as the records go, these charges lay dormant for the rest of the year 1655. At the beginning of 1656, according to the minutes of a Visitors' meeting held on 11 January in that year, the curtain is again lifted, showing that the Fellows had opened a new act by presenting a petition direct to the Protector himself as Chancellor of the University. He referred it to the Council of State, and they upon consideration of the matter found that the Visitors were the fit and proper persons to take cognisance of it. The third panel of Visitors, being apprised of this, decide that on 21 January,[2] at 2 p.m., in the lodgings of the President of Magdalen, they would once more make an effort to determine the weary controversy, Principal and Fellows all to be present.[3] But at some point within the ensuing ten days (unless, indeed, on account of the vagueness of the entry, it had been done in 1655) the Fellows, in despair of appealing to hereditary Visitors, usurping Visitors, cautious Protectors and non-committal Councils of State, resolved on a still more desperate venture: they solemnly deposed their Principal, taking advantage of the College statute "de amovendo Principale." This was an extreme procedure which could only prejudice their case hopelessly in the eyes of the Visitors. When the 21st of January came, the latter decided to consider first of all the grounds upon which the Fellows had taken up the bell and book,

[1] *Life and Times*, i. 296. Andrew Clark queries whether this phrase is an earlier form of "a storm in a tea-cup".

[2] Principal Hardy (*Jesus Coll.*, p. 119) makes a somewhat serious mistake over this meeting; he places it on "January 30, 1655" instead of "21 January, 1655-1656". It was on January 30, 1654-5, that the important decisions on the Pembroke interlude were arrived at (*supra* pp. 61-62).

[3] Burrows: *Register*, pp. 406-407.

and to examine next whether that same act was just or unjust according to the statutes of the College. All new[1] charges levelled against the Principal were ruled out of order and judgement was to be given on the evidence brought in support of the original gravamina (original in so far as they were the ground of the Principal's removal).[2] What with their realisation of the new false step they had taken, what with the disconcerting effect of the latest decisions of the Visitors, by a week later the Fellows appear in a much more chastened mood : they humbly desire the Visitors to choose Benjamin Parry as Censor instead of Ellis and Samuel Jones as Bursar instead of Laurence Jones[3]—the Anglican submitter replaced by the son of an erstwhile Irish bishop, the Puritan of Magdalen Hall giving way to another who was gradually growing to his Brynllywarch stature. The Principal had even consented to these changes ; it is to be noted that neither the new Censor nor the new Bursar were to subscribe the charges as written down in the Wynne MSS. ; it looked very much as if a small moderate party were growing up among the Fellows. The Register seems to breathe an incipient feeling of sweet reasonableness all round on this 28th of January. But how would the expulsion of Vaughan, the third member of the once dominant Anglican trio, from the Vice-Principalship affect this very delicate situation? That was undoubtedly the case,[4] a fact suggested by Professor Burrows when he says he was *restored* in 1660[5] and proved by an order of the Visitors at this very meeting that the Principal as Principal and the

[1] It is not at all clear whether these "new" charges were incorporated in the official indictment of 12 days later preserved in *Wynne MS.* 239. What is really important to notice is that the latter document arranges its charges under *nine* heads and that the articles of indictment adjudged upon at the final hearing in May were also *nine* in number.

[2] Burrows: *Register*, pp. 407-408. No progress was made at this particular sitting in pursuit of any of these resolutions.

[3] Only five colleges in the whole University were "restored" and allowed to govern themselves according to their statutes. It need hardly be said that Jesus was not one of them (Burrows: *Register*, p. 365, note *a*).

[4] It is a little perplexing, in face of the fact that Vaughan was certainly V.P. at the beginning of 1656, how Principal Hardy can enter his Fellowship period as "1628-*1653*" (*Jesus Coll.*, App. iii, p. 239).

[5] *Register*, p. 503; also Hardy, p. 129.

Fellows as Fellows were to proceed to elect a new Vice-Principal before the 5th of February; with him they were to choose a "Prælector Dialecticae," an old statutory officer of the College whose duty it was to lecture on Aristotelian philosophy to the Scholars and junior students.[1] This third panel, like the second on a former occasion, add the pious injunction that the Principal and Fellows should act as such for the government of the College "notwithstanding the present controversies."[2]

In reality, whatever impressions a surface view of the Register might yield, the situation was never worse than at this particular nodus of time. As evidence that the controversy was very much present and even growing in intensity, the Vice-Principal on his departure fought a fierce rearguard action by drawing up nine articles of impeachment against the Principal and got four representative Fellows to add their names to his as subscribers (they are the nine articles summarised on page 63, and by a delicious bit of irony are now preserved in the All Souls Library carefully written out in the hand of the impeached Principal himself). This was on February 2,[3] just three days before the Fellows were asked as a maximum limit to elect a new Vice-Principal. From some notes partly in cipher, written on the back of the folio containing the above charges, it seems pretty clear that the Visitors held more than one meeting in this month of February to unravel the tangle at Jesus; one important session was held on the 18th (a sitting not at all recorded in the Visitors' Register), at which proofs of the charges were insistently demanded. "For untill they have don wth giving in theyr proofs, the Case is not ready for a defence [last word very illegible] . . . because it is not lawfull for the defendant to breake in upon the proofs of the plaintiff."[4] That the Fellows were encountering considerable difficulty in bringing their proofs into sufficiently cogent contact with the charges is evident from the recorded meeting of the 20th February, two days afterwards.[5] On that date

[1] Hardy: *Jesus College*, p. 55.

[2] For the full minutes of this important session of 28 Jan., 1655-1656, see Burrows: *Register*, p. 408.

[3] See Note at end of this chapter. [4] *Wynne MS.* 239, f. 578, verso.

[5] *i.e.*, 20 February, 1655-1656. Principal Hardy's "1655" is a little misleading (*Jesus College*, p. 119).

the Visitors—including as they did such diverse characters as Goodwin and Conant, but at one in their trenchant attitude against abuses—solemnly declared, laying stress on their absolute unanimity in doing so, that having regard to the allegations against Roberts, the proofs advanced in their support, and the peculiar nature of the Fellows' proceedings in deposing him, they did not think he was justly and legally deposed. They quite as solemnly declared that the case was not thereby ended, neither the Fellows exonerated nor the Principal acquitted : the Visitors wanted further consideration of the "crimes" both parties had committed "and what censure either part have incurred" (an untoward reminder that the Visitors had not forgotten the derogation of their dignity implied in the Fellows' appeals to a powerless Pembroke and to an all-powerful if prudent Protector).[1] Though these dicta of the presiding body could not by any possibility be unexpected by the Fellows, their actual promulgation must have caused great hubbub in the society : at a session of 4 March there is no report from Jesus as to the election of Vice-Principal and Prælector, at least not to the satisfaction of the Visitors.[2] The latter were infinitely patient ; but on 19 May they took summary action and themselves chose Laurence Jones—it was to his advantage that he had been for some time delegate "pro negotiis publicis"[3] and had at the end of the Hilary term just preceding acted as respondent in the school of Theology maintaining one of the cardinal theses of the Calvinistic doctrine[4]—as Vice-Principal and Hamlet Puleston as Prælector (the minutes style him "Moderator"), and confirmed the former election of Benjamin Parry as Censor (for some reason, there was no reference to Samuel Jones as new

[1] Burrows: *Register*, pp. 409-410.

[2] *Ib.*, p. 410. The original order had demanded the names by 5 February, just a month before.

[3] *Reg. Convocn. T*, pp. 262, 271.

[4] *Reg. Congregn. Q.A*, f. 56, sub 20 March, 1655-1656. The entry reads thus: "Resp[ondens]: M^ro. Jones sen: e Coll Jesu". As this duty could fall on M.A.'s (as distinct from B.D.'s) only if they were four years from inception, Samuel Jones (M.A. 1654) was not eligible. "Seniority [see 'sen:' above] is to count from inception in arts, until the M.A. has disputed in his turn". (Clark: *Reg. Univ. Oxon.*, vol. II, pt. i, p. 109). Jones took the negative as to "An fides salvifica possit amitti?", and the affirmative over "An concupiscentia in renatis sit peccatum?". The latter was one of the most favoured points for disputation in Theology (*ib.*, pp. 194-217).

Bursar). The Principal was ordered to publish the same to the College, where they were to take effect at once.[1] Thus endeth confused and wearisome paragraphs telling of recrimination and bewildering re-arrangements, still leaving the one main issue undecided and the question of relative "crimes" forgotten.

This is to pass unnoticed the closing sentence of the Register opposite the above meeting of 19 May, 1656. After a long hearing followed by mature deliberation the Visitors *did* deliver their final judgement upon the nine articles exhibited against the Head: "*That they doe not see cause to confirme the act of the Fellowes in the amotion of their Principall.*"[2] This, amounting to a reiteration of their interim verdict of three months before, cannot be looked upon but as a colourless acquittal of Roberts and an oblique condemnation of the Fellows. Acquittal it was, nevertheless. The best proof of that is the continued payment of that augmentation of £92 a year granted him in 1650.[3] On a paper roll among the endless bundles of "declared accounts" at the Audit Office are heavy payments of such augmentations of salary due to certain Heads of Oxford colleges in pursuance of the ordinance of 1649, heavy because they were arrears for 15 months ending 29 September, 1656 (this last date is worth noticing); the name of the Principal of Jesus is there receiving £115 flanked on the one side by Dr. Daniel Greenwood, the squinting Principal of Brasenose who was Vice-Chancellor from 1650 to 1652, and on the other by Dr. John Conant, the Rector of Exeter who was to become Vice-Chancellor in 1657.[4] No Head received more than Roberts, and he received it in excellent company. Nor does it seem that he ever ceased, whatever suspicions clung around him, to be a member of that Convocation delegacy to which he was appointed in April, 1649, since evidence of his attendance thereat is scattered over the pages of the Register marked T. Veritably he could not

[1] Burrows: *Register*, p. 412.

[2] Burrows: *Register*, pp. 412-413.

[3] *Supra*, pp. 48-49.

[4] *Bundle 1216, roll 86.* These accounts were so called because by particular enactments after the Restoration (notably 13 Chas. II, cap. 3, and 13 and 14 Chas. II, cap. 16) the transactions of the Puritan committees had to be "declared" before the new Barons of the Exchequer and passed by them.

grumble at his treatment by the Visitors; and veritably he could thank his stars that the Republic's business in South Wales kept Jenkin Lloyd of Llandyssul away from Jesus.

Note: "Feb. 2, 1656" (p. 67).

Written to the left of the several signatures at the foot of the Wynne MS. 239, f. 578—the "nine articles"—is the date Feb. 2, 1656, i.e., 1656-1657. There are the strongest reasons, however, for holding this date to be 1656, a view which is supported (as late as 1724, it is true) by the biographer of Sir Leoline Jenkins, who states the charges were made in 1655, i.e., 1655-*1656* (Wm. Wynne: Life, Vol. I, pp. vii-viii). Otherwise we are faced with the following corollaries:—

(*a*) That the Anglican coterie displaced in 1656 had been replaced "in toto" by 1657.

(*b*) That the Visitors had receded from their own elections of May, 1656 (*supra*, pp. 68-69).

(*c*) That a second petition had been presented to Cromwell and that he had a second time referred it to the Visitors (therefore making a total of *three* altogether, including that figuring in the following chapter).

(*d*) That there were nine articles levelled against Roberts in 1656, and another (or the same) nine in 1657.

(*e*) That by a wonderful coincidence, the strife between the Principal and the Fellows reached its boiling point in February, 1656, and afterwards in February, 1657.

That the story of Visitation Jesus was an unfortunate tragedy is no defence for bringing in the harlequin and his clowns. At the same time it must be admitted that on the verso of this document is a date "Feb. 18," also marked 1656[-7]; that there is no convincing reason why Roberts (in whose hand f. 578 is written) should not mean 1656 to be 1657 as the legal year was then calculated; that there is an obvious fallacy in applying one interpretation to the old Principal of Jesus and quite another to one of his bitterest critics, the biographer quoted above. Yet the present writer does not feel disposed to accept the 1656-57 theory until the combined effect of (a)—(e) has been dissipated by direct evidence to the contrary.

(viii) "De Amovendo Principale."

The cumulative force of the Visitors' decisions on this 19th day of May, 1656—eight years to the day since Roberts was appointed Head of Jesus by the London Committee for Regulation—was to create a truly Gilbertian situation: a whitewashed pseudo-Puritan Principal was now harnessed to an administration in which the dominant party was definitely pro-Puritan, as all but the new Censor can be unhesitatingly put down in that category. A significant phrase in the Visitors' judgement in May about "*some* of the Fellows" only being in controversy with the Principal supports a view already suggested that by a process of attrition Roberts had managed to penetrate the solid front of his opponents; it is not irrelevant to remark that two of the articles of 1656 had it that he had been partial in his government and had made illegal and unstatutable elections in the said College (though no instances are adduced in proof).[1] In this context, it is difficult to resist the conclusion that Samuel Jones and his chief, remembering that Jones did not attest the charges of 1655-1656 and a year after is found acceding to that living of Llangynwyd once held by the Principal, were not very bad friends. The friendship with the two Parrys is still taken for granted. But he who thinks that the solemn and unanimous judgement of May had at last brought peace to Jesus is inhabiting a fool's paradise. Unfortunately for the Principal, though one or two of the Fellows might feel a little indulgent towards him and though his bitterest Anglican enemies were either removed from the College or jockeyed from all important posts, two of the new officers were in the forefront of the recent struggle, one being Moderator of Dialectic and the other occupying the important post of Vice-Principal. As the latter had been previously Bursar, he would be particularly well-informed in the subject-matter of the charges against the Principal which were deemed unproven by the Visitors. What defence therefore had they for promoting such a man in the hierarchy of the College? Did they not stultify their own solemn judgement? These questions remind us of the fact that the Visitors did not rise from their sitting of the 19th

[1] *Wynne MS.* 239, f. 578 (articles numbered 5 and 7).

May before demanding once more that the Principal and Fellows should " profit " the College accounts by 30 June (what accounts exactly, and covering what period, is not defined).[1] More recriminations must have followed, for on 7 July the Visitors promulgate a new order, ambiguously worded, that the aforesaid accounts should be passed " without any contest to whom it belongs to " ; the Principal and Fellows were to view all accounts not yet passed amongst them and wherein they differed (well knowing they would !) to bring these differences by 28 July at the usual hour of 2 p.m. to the usual lodgings of the President of Magdalen. " And that in whom it shall be found the default lyes of not bringing them in (through absence or otherwise) they shall be proceeded against as the demerit of it is."[2] One can read between the lines that President Goodwin was about ready to fling some of his " nine caps " in the faces of the Welshmen[3] and that the temper of the imperturbable Conant was fast giving way ; perhaps it was as well, in view of his theatrical interposition at the Comitia of 1651, that Dr. John Owen did not attend the meetings of this period very faithfully.

With this dire threat the affairs of Jesus and the interview at Magdalen mysteriously disappear from the Register of the Visitors ; no light is forthcoming from the archives of the College ; as to the dry minutes of the delegates " pro negotiis," they suddenly brighten up by showing both Dr. Roberts and Thomas Ellis attending a session of the delegacy held on 2 July, 1657, leaving us to mere conjecture whether those warring souls set out from Jesus in company or sat in juxtaposition.[4] Samuel Jones, one of Michael's possible friends among the Fellows, took Presbyterian orders at Taunton in the beginning of 1657[5] and was starting his historic association

[1] Burrows : *Register*, p. 412. [2] *Ib.*, p. 414.

[3] Designed as part of Goodwin's epitaph at Bunhill Fields, but not allowed by the Anglican authorities to be graved on the stone, were three line extolling his profound knowledge of the "materia" and the "forma" of the institutions of the Christian church (Calamy : *Contin. of Acct.*, I, p. 91). Perhaps a reference to his equally profound knowledge of how cultured Welshmen could run to seed might have a better chance of appearing.

[4] *Reg. Convocn. T*, p. 304. It is also significant that this was the one occasion when they were present together since 1654.

[5] Calamy : *Acct.*, ii, 721.

with Llangynwyd in May of the same year;[1] and the dying energies of the Visitors were distracted between a vain combat against corrupt resignations at All Souls and an equally vain effort to institute terminal Fellowships in the colleges generally. The Principal of Jesus was left isolated at the mercy of his critics. No special inspiration is needed to divine the result: before the end of 1657 a new Principal was reigning in his stead, Francis Howell by name, Fellow of Exeter and member himself of the second and third panel of Visitors.[2] The details of the final scene at Jesus are quite obscure and opinions vary as to the exact manner of Roberts' exit: "resigned" says Professor Burrows;[3] "resigned into the hands of the Protector" are the words of Principal Hardy;[4] "removed" (without further addendum) testified his successor Howell in giving evidence before the King's Commissioners in 1660;[5] "deprived by Cromwell of what I had" were the ex-Principal's own words in 1672 and 1676;[6] "remov'd . . . to make roome for a more active man" said his Anglican detractors during the Fellowship litigation of 1668-1673.[7] The latter source adds that the Fellows found a "pretence," as they had done before in 1655-1656, in the College statute "de amovendo Principale," which laid it down that the major part of the Fellows might, "si opus fuerit," declare that the Principal was unfit for the place. The truth probably lies between the ex-Principal's own remark and the glosses of his Restoration opponents: first he was removed by the Fellows, probably with the connivance of the exhausted Visitors; then this proceeding was justified to the Chancellor-Protector in the form of a petition; this time the Protector did *not* refer the matter to his Council of State. It is very certain, notwithstanding the dearth of documentary evidence, that Jesus men (both within the College and without) were agog with excitement that autumn; especially interesting would have been the impressions of Jonathan Roberts and Jenkin

[1] *Lambeth Aug. Book* 998, No. 68; adm. by Triers, 4 May.

[2] Roberts finished in September 1657 (*Wynne MS.* 240, f. 510); his successor was appointed on 24 October (Hardy: *Jesus Coll.*, p. 126).

[3] *Register*, p. 413, note *a*. [4] *Jesus College*, p 120. [5] *Ib.*, p. 129.

[6] *Panton Papers*, O. III. 16; *Tanner MS.* 314, f. 4 (letter of Dr. Michael Roberts to Dean Sancroft bearing date 26 April. No year is attached, but the context decides it to be 1676).

[7] *Wynne MS.* 240, f. 510; as to litigation, see *infra*, chap. x.

Lloyd, the first now Puritan vicar of Llanfair Dyffryn Clwyd,[1] and the second (bland as ever) busy persuading the farmers of Carmarthen to pay up their quota of the military assessment voted by Parliament in June of that year.[2] But, unlike Philip Henry, they do not seem to have utilised their leisure moments in writing diaries.

The excitement was not all over the disappearance of Roberts. The new Principal was not allowed to come in too peacefully. Such was the College tradition: how Roberts came to Jesus we are painfully aware; but it is a curious fact that not one of the three elections directly previous to his had been carried out without there being more than a suspicion of lightning in the air.[3] Emboldened by the success of the "de amovendo" expedient and in face of the certainty that Jesus would be the last College in the University to recover its old autonomy of jurisdiction, a majority of the Fellows seem to have met in 1657 and elected to the vacant post Dr. Seth Ward,[4] the Savilian Professor of Astronomy and after the Restoration Bishop of Exeter and Salisbury in succession. This appointment was immediately quashed either by the Visitors or by the Protector. To the great delight of Anthony Wood, who had as little use for Ward as for the bitterest Puritan fanatic in the land.[5] In fact, his accession would have meant that one adventurer had been followed by another, of less pugnacity perhaps, but of a more comprehensive mind. Dr. John Walker admits that Ward had sadly degenerated from the principles he professed when Fellow of Sidney Sussex at Cambridge, but says he was now elected Head of Jesus "by the Direction of Dr. Mansel."[6] This statement not only traverses Professor Burrows' theory about the ex-Principal's Spartan silence, but attributes to the Anglican caucus at the College greater numbers and influence in 1656-1657 than has been admitted in these pages. Yet those who keep closely in view that Samuel Jones had already departed for Llangynwyd and that the two other professed Puritans, Laurence Jones and Hamlet Puleston, were both retained as Fellows by

[1] Calamy: *Acct.*, ii, 716; *Continuation*, ii, 838.
[2] Firth and Rait: *Acts and Ordinances*, ii, 1085.
[3] Hardy: *Jesus College*, pp. 47-48, 88.
[4] *Ibid.*, p. 126—"the College possesses no record of the election".
[5] *Life and Times*, i, 363. [6] *Sufferings*, ii, 159 (col. 1).

the Mansell reconstruction of 1660, might be disposed to see more truth in Walker's story than appears at first sight.[1] "But the Protector, according to the plenitude of his Power, put in one Howel, with a Promise however of £80 per Ann. to Dr. Ward, which yet was never paid him."[2] As to the likelihood of Oliver promising an £80 sop to a man who could never have been legally elected Head under the rules and forms then obtaining, that must be definitely ruled out of court; as to Howell having been placed at Jesus by the fiat of the Protector, the former's own words in 1660 that he "was Collegiately chosen according to the Statutes by the Fellows" are no real disclaimer[3]—in other words, he meant to say that the chastened Fellows were graciously given leave to elect him. Incidentally, the new Principal's only connection with Wales was that he hailed from Cornwall and *might* (like another Puritan minister of that county) have some acquaintance with the "Welch" language;[4] more interesting is the fact that, when the outlook and ministrations of Charles Edwards became unsatisfactory to the parishioners of Llanrhaiadr-ym-Mochnant, Francis Howell was nominated by Richard Cromwell to fill the vacant rectory.[5] This in turn throws new light on the character of the old Scholar of Jesus and supplies a new example of Puritan pluralism (since there is not the slightest evidence that the Principal of Jesus ever came to Llanrhaiadr).[6]

Interesting or no, the fortunes of Englishmen like Ward and Howell are foreign to the subject of this paper. Let us therefore return to that doughty man of Môn, Dr. Michael Roberts. Ex-Principal Mansell, then about to be "restored" a second time, in giving evidence before the Royal Commissioners of 1660, deliberately treated the

[1] Hardy: *Jesus College*, pp. 130, 240.
[2] *Sufferings*. ii, 159 (col. 1). [3] Hardy: *Jesus College*, p. 129.
[4] *Noncon. Memorial* (Palmer). 1802 ed., i, 358 (said of Samuel Tapper, of St. Merryn). But would not "Welch" mean "Cornish" in this context?
[5] Adm. by Triers, 12 Jan., 1658-1659 (*Lambeth Aug. Book* 999, No. 525, f. 172); Edwards had been adm. 15 May, 1657 (998, f. 34, No. 99); but this was really only a re-sanction by the London Triers of an interest he had possessed there since 13 March, 1652-1653 (*Lamb. Aug. Book* 1004, f. 50).
[6] Cp. the Abergele connection of Dr. John Conant.

Robertian tenure of the Headship as a blank and never so much as mentioned Michael's name, just as the Cavalier lawyers of the Restoration referred to 1660 as "12 Charles II."[1] In an undated list of Jesus Principals among the Tanner MSS., Roberts is given his name and proper title, but his numbered place in the succession is left unmarked.[2] History, like Nature, abhors a vacuum and cannot afford the Roman luxury of deleting unpleasant events from the calendar. Far from being a blank, readers of this work and three boards of Visitors would all agree that it was too abundantly full. A man who could survive the unequivocal censure of the first board, the equally strong condemnation of the second, and extract a unanimous acquittal—of the kind it was—from the third, must be conceded to have been an extraordinary character. Did he not also survive (though we have only his own word for this) the temporary dissolution of the society in 1649, deposition by his own Fellows in 1655-1656, the combined onset of Puritan and Anglican alike, and only succumbed in the end to "force majeure" applied by the greatest personality of that generation? Even then he was allowed by the College that had discarded him to remain in residence there for a good number of months,[3] and is discovered, six months after his fall, acting as Convocation delegate "pro negotiis publicis."[4] Even more—Roberts wrote in 1672 that he was not commonly guilty of refusing promotions (which was very true), but that he did not repent refusing one worth £240 per annum offered him by Philip Jones "when they called him Comptroler of Whyte Hall in the Usurpers time."[5] If this offer was ever really made, was it a gentle inducement to wheedle the Principal out of the College or a snug solatium after his deposition? It requires a considerable effort to believe that Roberts refused without repenting a post with nearly double the emoluments of Jesus.

[1] Hardy: *Jesus College*, p. 129—evidence submitted in August 1660. It is worth noting that Francis Howell, who followed Mansell as witness, supplied the gap.

[2] 338, f. 19.

[3] Hardy: *Jesus College*, p. 126.

[4] *Reg. Convocn. T.* p. 319, sub 20 March, 1657-1658.

[5] *Panton Papers*, O. III. 16—letter of 10 Dec. to Bishop Robert Morgan. This document is otherwise important as furnishing an interesting (if unconscious) reflex of the power of Philip Jones of Llangyfelach in the latter years of the Protectorate.

(ix) Quasi-Puritanism.

The Fellows and Principal between them atrophied the higher life of the College and irretrievably damaged it as a feeder of the Puritan movement in Wales, just at the time when that movement was in a critically formative state. If pungent pamphleteers like Alexander Griffith were exposing the failure of the itinerant system under the Propagation Act,[1] if Major-General James Berry in his letters to Thurloe was bitterly bewailing the lack of Puritan preachers on the countryside,[2] if John Lewis of Glasgrug and Dr. John Ellis of Dolgelley were seriously agitating for a college in Wales for the training of ministers,[3] and if a High Sheriff of Brecknock in 1658-1659 was scornfully contrasting the number of souls in the various parishes of the county with the list of pastors settled there[4]—did these considerations not constitute a tremendous indictment of Jesus College as a reservoir of Puritan preachers? Was it not an institution eminently Welsh and was its Principal not a good and stalwart Puritan? Was it not to be naturally expected that from its halls would come forth, fired with the ardour of triumphant Puritanism, learned young men who would complement the energies of the untutored Vavasorian itinerants, level-headed evangelists who would proclaim a gospel purged of the heterodox extremes lamented by Dr. John Owen in a sermon delivered before the Commons in 1656?[5] Six years before, Vavasor himself and his Propagation colleagues had sent several letters to London and the Universities as "the likeliest places to afford helps";[6] his only reinforcements from Jesus were a disgruntled Fellow like Jonathan Roberts and a dissatisfied Scholar like Charles Edwards. Generally, says Vavasor in his apologia of 1661, the lack of the Welsh tongue discouraged likely candidates, but that would not apply to the very great majority of the alumni of Jesus. Of course, the

[1] esp. in *Strena Vavasoriensis* (1654), p. 5.

[2] *Thurloe St. Papers*, iv, 334 (from Wrexham, 21 Dec., 1655); 565 (from Brecon, 28 Feb., 1655-1656).

[3] *H.P.M.*, 233 (nn. 10 and 11). Such a college was to be "derivative and subordinate to the two mother Universities".

[4] Quoted by Walker in *Sufferings*, i, 160-161, 163.

[5] Dr. Thos. Rees: *Hist. Prot. Noncon.* (1883), pp. 95-96.

[6] *The Bird in the Cage Chirping* (1661), p. 4 (*Brief Narrative of the former Propagation* prefixed).

Fellow Jenkin Lloyd was one of the 25 "approvers" nominated in the Propagation Act. *He* an approver of godly and painful men!

Some response to the Puritan appeal was made during the later régime of the Triers: John Prichard, an old Merton man, became V[erbi] D[ei] M[inister][1] in some unascertained sphere in North Wales,[2] and is found saying a good word for the two works of Richard Jones of Llanfair (in one of them following the example of Principal Roberts);[3] Edward Pierce, after graduating M.A. in 1657, proceeded to the pastorate of Llanycil;[4] Jenkin Christopher, a B.A. of Jesus, did some preaching work in the neighbourhood of Llanblethian;[5] Richard Taylor, an M.A. who boasted Samuel Jones as tutor for some time, succeeded Ambrose Mostyn in 1659 as Puritan minister of Holt;[6] and William Thomas, another M.A. from Jesus not recorded in the Register of Congregation, and always to be very carefully distinguished not only from the many Puritan William Thomases of the period but also from Dr. William Thomas, an old Fellow of the College,[7] settled down as minister of St. Mary Church in Glamorgan.[8] It is probable that the Principal pulled some strings to get Thomas Davies and Richard Rowlands, both M.A.'s from Jesus,[9] approved for the rectories of Llantrisant and Aberffraw respectively, both in Anglesey;[10] it is certain that the Fellow John Parry acceded to the rectory of

[1] Compare V.D.M. as a description of Matthew Mead of Stepney, M.D.V. on the tombstone of William Jenkyn of Christ Church in London (Calamy: *Contin.*, i, 18; ii, 614).

[2] There were two or three Prichards acting as ministers in Denbighshire at this time, one (Edward Prichard) being curate of Ruabon and occasionally doing duty at Chirk (*Chirk Castle Accts.*, p. 81 and n. 251). But no *John*.

[3] *Testún Test. Newydd* (1653), p. [9]; *Perl y Cymro* (1655), p. [17].

[4] *Reg. Congregn.* QA, f. 188^{v}; *Seren Gomer*, Nov., 1901, p. 323.

[5] *Ibid.*, f. 204; *Religious Developments in Wales* (1923), p. 46.

[6] *Reg. Congregn.* QA, f. 189^{v}; Calamy: *Acct.*, ii, 716.

[7] Prof. Burrows has not done so. On p. 505 of his edition of the *Register* he refers to him as servitor in 1651 and has an addendum on p. 592 that the same man became Bishop of St. David's in 1677. As the latter was Fellow of Jesus in *1635* (Hardy: *Jes. Coll.*, 239) it is not easy to see how he could be servitor in 1651.

[8] Calamy: *Acct.*, ii, 731; *Lambeth Aug. Book* 999, f. 57, adm. 30 June, 1658.

[9] *Reg. Congregn. QA*, f. 188.

[10] Thos. Shankland: *Art. in Seren Gomer*, Nov., 1901, 323.

Queenhope (Flint) in 1659,[1] and equally certain that he did not receive it through the help of Roberts, then ex-Principal and possessing no influence whatsoever. A Scholar and a servitor, Timothy Thomas and Timothy Roberts[2] respectively, settled down as Puritan pastors outside Wales, one in Shropshire and the other at Barton in Westmoreland.[3] There is a curious parallelism of names between a few other Jesus men and persons who appear as approved ministers in the Lambeth records of the Triers; but the nexus is not close enough for definite proof of identity. In any case, neither those nor the good men already mentioned were Puritans of the highest eminence; and from a Puritan point of view, it is a melancholy fact that fully half of them submitted to the Act of Uniformity in August, 1662. One, Jenkin Christopher, was lucky enough to be made Fellow of Jesus at the Restoration.[4] The occurrence of the name David Lloyd both in the Buttery Books and in the Register of Congregation might rashly tempt one to think he was the eldest son of Morgan Llwyd o Wynedd, did not considerations of age make it impossible,[5] and were there not the strongest grounds for believing that this David Lloyd after graduating B.A. in 1655[6] became master of Cowbridge school about 1656 and vicar of Llantrisant in Glamorgan in 1665.[7]

The conclusion of this last sentence leads us to the point that a good crop of Jesus men who entered the College during the Roberts dispensation was found reinforcing the ranks of the restored Anglican Church of 1660 and after (these being a class apart from the Puritan con-

[1] *Tanner MS.* 314, f. 21: Archbp. of Wales: *Landmarks* (1912), App. G, p. 303, sub "Hope".

[2] As to Roberts, see *Clark's Yearly Lists* (1652), section ix. Timothy Thomas has been referred to already (*supra*, p. 37).

[3] Calamy: *Acct.*, ii, 752. [4] Hardy: *Jesus College*, p. 240.

[5] J. H. Davies: *Gweithiau Morgan Llwyd*, ii, App. iii, 314-315.

[6] *Reg. Congregn.* QA, ff. 108. 203.

[7] Dolben Papers (*Bodl. MSS Add.* C. 307, ff. 24. 118): *First Fruits Certificates, Llandaff*, File 11, Schedule 20 Oct., 1664-20 Oct., 1666. Dr. Lemuel Hopkin-James seems to leave the impression that Lloyd only started work at Cowbridge in 1662 (*Old Cowbridge*, 1922, p. 263). The letter sent by Dr. Hugh Lloyd (Bishop of Llandaff) to Archbp. Sheldon and dated December 26, 1665, puts the matter beyond dispute—"he hath Laudably for Nine yeares taught a gramar Schoole at Cowbridge" (*Dolben Papers*).

formists). Such were William Bynner, collated in 1661 to a vicarage choral in St. Asaph ;[1] John Foulkes, admitted on 29 December, 1660, to the vicarage of Eglwysbach in the deanery of Rhos ;[2] William Foulkes, a thoroughly competent Welsh scholar, made Fellow of Jesus in 1660, rector of Llanbrynmair in May, 1661, and of Llanfyllin in the following July ;[3] and Meredith Penry, almost certainly a brother of the James Penry who was expelled at the Visitation of 1648 (both being Brecknock men and both sons of a clergyman), presented under the Great Seal to the rectory of Llanhamlach in July, 1660,[4] and admitted in February, 1663, to officiate at Brecon in the parish of St. John the Evangelist and the chapel of the Blessed Virgin.[5] Other Jesus men who came to the diocese of St. David's were Herbert Hughes, rector of Oxwich in Gower after December, 1662 ;[6] Morgan Davies, made rector of Cosheston in Pembroke on 28 September, 1663 ;[7] while Edmund Meyrick, who entered the College in 1656, became one of the most successful pluralists under the dispensation of Bishop William Lucy.[8] Two others, James Bowen and Philip Roberts by name, saw no objection to be made Fellows of the College in the days of Sir Leoline Jenkins ;[9] these two, together with the Francis Griffith who became B.A. in 1658,[10] re-appear afterwards on the First Fruits files of the Welsh dioceses. And even this longish list takes no cognisance of men whose names figure on the Buttery Books but who are not recorded in the Congregation Registers as having proceeded to their degrees. As to the layman William Glynne he was, like his father, glad to make his peace at the Restoration, though probably (if present) more steady on his horse in

[1] *Reg. Congregn. QA*, f. 205 (B.A., 1659) ; *First Fruits Certifs.*, St. Asaph, File 14, Sched. 20 Apr., 1660-20 Apr., 1661.

[2] *Ib.*, f 201^{v} (B.A., 1653) ; *ib.* *ib.*

[3] *Ib.*, f. 189^{v} (M.A., 1659) ; *ib.*, Sched. 20 Apr., 1661-20 Oct., 1661 ; *Reg. Convocn.* T, p. 337 ; Hardy : *Jesus Coll.*, p. 240.

[4] *Ib.*, f. 203 (B.A., 1655) ; *Patent Rolls*, 12 Chas. II, Pt. I, No. 377.

[5] *First Fruits Certifs.*, St. David's, File 13, Schedule 20 October, 1662-20 April, 1663.

[6] *Reg. Congregn.* QA, f. 205^{v} (B.A., 1659) ; *ib.* *ib.*

[7] *Ib.*, f. 203 (B.A., 1655) ; *ib* , Schedule 20 Apr.,-20 Oct., 1663.

[8] Hardy : *Jesus College*, p. 145 ; *First Fruits Certifs.*, St. David's, Files 13 and 14, passim.

[9] *Reg Congregn.* QA, f. 189^{v} (Roberts M.A., 1659), f. 204^{v} (Bowen B.A., 1658) ; Hardy ; *Jesus Coll.*, p. 240.

[10] *Ib.*, f. 204^{v}.

the Coronation procession of 23 April, 1661.[1] We can bring this tedious catalogue of conformists to an end by asking how genuine Puritanism could possibly flourish under a hypocritical Head and critical Fellows, among "intervall men" who could plant and nourish long beards in the years before 1660 and in that year "strip them[selves] of their puritanicall cut and forthwith put on a cassock reaching to their heels tied close with a sanctified circingle"?[2] Wood, here again, does not confine his remarks to any one college, but with what ring of truth his words come home to the Jesus society of those days? The allusion to beards implies that Puritan Oxford and Puritan Cambridge did not follow quite the same tonsorial fashion; for if Wood's somewhat rambling remarks in the "Athenae" have been understood aright, he says that the voracious Cantabs who trooped to Oxford in the days of the Visitation wore their hair short, having undergone "the Committee-Cut."[3] Short or long, the generality of Jesus were trimmers enough to follow the fashion; and we may be sure that if Dr. John Owen when Vice-Chancellor made it a practice to attend Congregation and Convocation with his Puritan hat on and with "as much powder in his hair that would discharg[e] eight cannons,"[4] Dr. Michael Roberts would make a valiant effort to have his head ordered both ways in a similar manner.

Never forgetting the group of College graduates who in 1660 strove to forget the "puritanicall cut" and the crop of Puritan conformists who surrendered at "black Bartholomew," it is matter for high humour to watch its inmates deploying their forces on the new Puritan alignment in the interval after 1648: how in 1649 they became jointly responsible with Pembroke under its thorough-paced Puritan Head Henry Langley for the 30th sermon (per rotam) at St. Mary's at seven in the morning on

[1] The point is that his father John Glynne (of Glynllifon), then prime Serjeant-at-Law, was actually thrown off his horse (W. R. Williams: *Parly. Hist. Wales*, pp. 60-61).

[2] *Life and Times*, i, 333, 356-357, 366. The beard-planter he names was Nathaniel Crew, Fellow of Lincoln, afterwards Bishop of Durham.

[3] ii, 743 (1692).

[4] *Life and Times*, i, 221, 300, 359. These habits of the learned Doctor are not usually emphasised by his Nonconformist biographers. The "cannons" are a punning reference to the canons of Christ Church who were dispossessed in 1648.

Tuesdays;[1] how we read that Dr. Michael Roberts saw well to deliver Puritan "lectures" at Wolvercote, a duty only intermittently carried out, while all the salary was unblushingly pocketed;[2] how in November, 1653, when the Visitors were bent on having more frequent preaching in College chapels and Jesus was in the hands of a coterie of Anglican submitters, the Principal (no doubt with his hand on his breast) reported to them that four of his Senior Masters of Arts were content to preach in the chapel every other week during term and that two Regent Masters were willing to conform to any signification of the Visitors;[3] and how the Principal had to report on 28 January, 1655-1656, whether all his B.A.'s and undergraduates had heard a sermon or attended any other religious exercise on the Lord's Day and delivered on the same day between 6 and 9 p.m. their "experiences" to some person or persons in the College of known ability and piety—this on the very day when the Principal and Fellows were severally expecting, but did not receive, the considered judgement of the Visitors as to whether the former had been legally deposed by the latter or not.[4] One would like to know what John Parry of Dublin and his brother Benjamin thought of all this; one consolation they certainly had—if they had stayed in Trinity, they would (sons of an Irish bishop as they were, deans and bishops as they were later to become[5]) have had to conform outwardly to a regimen as strict and punctilious as that at Oxford.[6] To return from this Irish digression, the ques-

[1] *Life and Times*, i, 159. This rota was an adaptation of an University practice dating from the beginning of the century.

[2] As evidence of the thoroughness with which the Jesus authorities had Puritanised that district, *not a single conventicle was discovered there in 1669* (Oxfordshire returns in Lyon Turner: *Orig. Recs.*, iii, 823-828). It is very sure that the dissenters who foregathered there at James Beckford's house in 1672-1673 did not trace their spiritual ancestry from Dr. Michael Roberts (*S.P. Dom. Car. II, Entry Book* 38A, p. 249).

[3] Burrows: *Register*, p. 382—Principal's return sent in on 29 November. As to the exact signification of "regency" in Arts and the several duties of "necessary regents", there is a very full account by Clark in *Reg. Univ. Oxon.*, vol. II, part i, pp. 90-101.

[4] Burrows: *Register*, p. 407 (examine full minutes of this meeting).

[5] *Life and Times*, ii, 399, 431-432.

[6] R. Dunlop: *Ireland under the Commonwealth*, ii, Doct. 632, pp. 491-492.

tion will obtrude itself (in re-inforcement of a similar query in the preceding paragraph) what real religious feeling could be expected from Anglicans who had swallowed the Covenant, from Presbyterians who had sworn the Negative Oath and the Engagement, from pious undergraduates who suddenly developed a lame leg on coming out of Oxford taverns?[1] One looks in vain at Jesus for many ingenious youths of tender conscience, given to express zeal against superstition, like Nicholas Braine of Exeter;[2] it is somewhat difficult to conceive of Samuel Jones, the most likely of the tutors to do it, being so "grand a Presbyterian" as that mentor of Wood's at Merton who was always praying in his chamber;[3] it would be preposterous to expect a Jesus man to walk down the lane of the Seven Deadly Sins except to bait the Quakers who foregathered there[4] or to drink coffee at Tillyard's except to join roystering Fellows from All Souls in whispering damnation to the cause of the Republic.[5] It would certainly be refreshing for some of them on 15 July, 1657, to turn in at the church of All Hallows to hear an old Jesus student named Vavasor Powell addressing a huge multitude of Oxonians, thundering forth against the type of piety produced by the Universities of the time, incidentally (it may be) recounting the miserable response of his old College to the appeals of 1650.[6] What a pity it is that Anthony Wood, who alone has seen well to record this interesting event in Vavasor's life, did not condescend to details and portray the wry smiles that passed over the countenances of Dr. Michael's disciples as they listened to one of the sincerest men of his generation and an unflinching believer in the imminence of the Second Coming! Reference to the Quakers' quarters in Oxford reminds us that Charles Lloyd of Dolobran and his brother Thomas were students of Jesus at this time (Charles was admitted to the degree of M.A. just five days after Vavasor's visit[7]). A distinguished historian of the Society of Friends, lately deceased, has traced the conversion of the Lloyds to the new gospel back to the impression made upon them by the bearing of the persecuted sect under the rude behaviour

[1] *Life and Times*, i, 298.
[2] Burrows: *Register*, p. 174.
[3] *Life and Times*, i, 162.
[4] *Ibid.*, i, 191.
[5] *Ibid.*, i, 201.
[6] *Ibid.*, i, 221, 293.
[7] *Reg. Congregn.* QA, f. 188^{v}; *Reg. Convocn.* T, pp. 306, 307.

of academicians.[1] Possibly, but it is quite as likely to have been the fruit of disgust with the hypocrisy and cant of their contemporaries at Jesus. Of Baptists and Independents—probably the two brothers would once be classed among the latter—the College boasted few indeed; and very probably Oliver had more reason than one for choosing as new Principal in 1657 a man who was Reader of Moral Philosophy in the University, member also of the Independent congregation formed at Oxford by Dr. Thomas Goodwin, and one who was to die in 1680 a preaching Nonconformist.[2]

But the ills of Jesus were too great to be cured by a Reader in Philosophy. Not yet, nor for long years to come, would memory let die the stiff-lipped answer of John Hughes in 1648, nor the action of the old stock in barricading the doors of the College to the new Fellows in the same year; and as for the nine years' academic vendetta, how could that be forgotten when two ex-Principals, Mansell and Roberts, were both partaking of common meals in the Hall for the greater part of 1658?[3] It would not be human nature for the spirit of contrariness to stop at the Fellows, or to cease with the downfall of the first Puritan Principal; otherwise, the Register marked QA would be shorn of one of its most piquant entries. On folio 68[v] it records how on the first of April, 1658, two scholars of Jesus, one surnamed Madrinell and the other Maurice, had to appear in full Congregation on bended knees and make there their submission, the first for raising tumults and fighting, the second for refusing to go to prison when commanded to do so.[4] Had it not been for the persistent anti-Puritan attitude of All Souls and the Hitchcock troubles at Lincoln, Jesus would stand without a peer for refractoriness in the whole University. Nor did this penchant for tumult die down at the Restoration: the thin ears and facile pen of the antiquary Wood (who loved Jesus just a little less than Christ Church) have seen to it that the exuberant youth who in 1661 half-

[1] W. C. Braithwaite; *Second Period of Quakerism* (1919), p. 352.

[2] *Nonconformist Memorial* (ed. Palmer, 1802), i, 234, 239-240; *Life and Times*, i, 148; ii, 483-484.

[3] Hardy: *Jesus College*, pp 126-127—"under the circumstances [the meals] would have some elements of embarrassment".

[4] "quod iussus carcerem adire non obtemperaverim".

killed an actor for gibing at the wearers of the leek[1] and the two commoners with a servitor of the College who gave Wood himself ill language in Jesus College Lane have all received due notice in his diaries and papers.[2] Less heinous offences do not escape : let Wood be accused of playing at cards with a Papist on a Sunday afternoon, it is a gossiping B.D. of Jesus who gets the fault ;[3] when the second volume of his "Athenae" appeared in 1692, it was an M.A. of Jesus who angered him extremely by saying it had set all Oxford in a flame ;[4] let the University go without a celebration of the Act of July for eight or nine years, six of those are at once attributed to the laziness and covetousness of two Welshmen who happened to be Vice-Chancellors and Principals of Jesus.[5] Well may Andrew Clark refer to the constant flow of Celtic energy and enthusiasm to Oxford from across the Welsh border ;[6] it was one of Wood's congenial duties to show how this energy (and sometimes laziness) was very often misdirected in the 17th century. Sometimes, indeed, it fell to the lot of a distinguished son of the College to castigate in unmeasured terms the sins of other sons differently distinguished. How a sometime servitor of Jesus was expelled for misbehaviour, imposed himself upon several dioceses by a deft manipulation of periwigs, and escaped arrest by riding away on stolen horses, can be read in letters written by Bishop William Lloyd of St. Asaph to Archbishop Sancroft[7]—there we find his name was Henry Davies, nephew to the Thomas Davies of Anglesey befriended by Dr. Michael Roberts in the days of his Principalship and remembered in his will. Let students of the College be reassured, nevertheless, that the profane wit who was pulled down at the Act of 1651 was a Trinity man,[8] and that the David Jones who irreverently corrected the President of St. John's when the latter was delivering a lecture "in Græcâ scholâ" on ancient sacrificial feasts was not (as one might expect) from the Welsh College at all, but from Christ Church.[9]

[1] *Life and Times*, i, 406 (n. 5). He must be a poor sort of Welshman who does not feel proud of this student of Jesus.
[2] *Ib.*, ii, 487-488. [3] *Ib.*, iii, 254. [4] *Ib.*, iii, 395.
[5] *Ib.*, iii, 427. (Doctors John Lloyd and Jonathan Edwards.)
[6] *Reg. Univ. Oxon.*, vol. II, part i, preface, p. xv.
[7] *Tanner MS.* 35, ff. 113, 119-120.
[8] *Supra*, p. 54. [9] *Life and Times*, iii, 131-132.

And it was in a later generation still that the academic world was amused by the prolonged struggle which resulted in the election of Dr. John Wynne as Principal in 1713.[1] It may be objected that the citation of remote evidence from the latter decades of the 17th century is not altogether relevant as criticism of the Roberts dispensation, remembering also that Jesus was not exactly a haven of peace before he became Principal and that he was deprived of that office more than two years before the Restoration. Such objections ignore the facts that it was Roberts himself who set the society in a roar ten years before 1648, that from 1648 to 1657 he irritatingly played upon the Cymric turbulence which was only too ready to arise in its affairs, and that he and the Fellows supplied excellent precedents for the rebellious spirits of later days.

Endless strife and palpable insincerity notwithstanding, Jesus flourished in many ways during the days of Roberts. Very naturally the reactions of war told upon its numbers: a comparison of its matriculating list in 1650-1651 with that of 1638-1639 does not show well by the side of several colleges which show considerable increases, but leaves it to enjoy the uninspiring company of Lincoln and its opportunist Rector, Dr. Paul Hood.[2] By 1657, however, Jesus boasted 53 commoners in addition to the foundationers.[3] It is true that, following the depleting vigour of the first Visitors, an artificial prosperity was given to the College by the intrusion of Fellows from Cambridge and Scholars from other Oxford colleges; it is also true that in later years students voluntarily entered it from both these sources, such as Edward Pierce from Cambridge, Nicholas Nicholls from Pembroke, and Francis Dove (a Wiltshire native) from Magdalen Hall.[4] Nor were these latter uproarious nondescripts like the Cantabrigian Hitchcock at Lincoln,[5] but studious and law-abiding men who did well in the Schools: all three proceeded to the degree of B.A. in 1652-1653,[6] while Pierce

[1] Hardy: *Jesus College*, pp. 163-166.
[2] Burrows: *Register*, Introd., cxxx. [3] Hardy: *Jesus College*, p. 126.
[4] *Clark's Yearly Lists*, sub anno 1652, section ii. On 8 April, 1652, Pierce (not always easy to distinguish from an Edward *Price* in residence at the same time) was granted a dispensation to count his Cambridge terms for his B.A. at Oxford (*Reg. Congregn. QA*, f. 23).
[5] See especially Burrows: *Register*, pp. 345-346.
[6] *Reg. Congregn.* QA, ff. 201, 201^{v}.

was admitted M.A. in 1657.[1] On the other hand, the Owen Price who was first elected Scholar in October, 1648, spent his later academic career at Christ Church (in the meantime having made an excursus into Wales as Puritan schoolmaster[2]), taking his M.A. as a member of that college in 1656.[3] Price and Pierce paid more than a passing homage to the Puritan faith, the former in particular; as to Dove, his religious outlook remains unknown, nor has it been ascertained whether he was a collateral descendant of the Thomas Dove who was one of the original Scholars of the College in the reign of Queen Elizabeth and Bishop of Peterborough in the time of James I.[4]

Few nobility and few gentry, says Wood, came to the University during the "intervall."[5] Jesus, however, witnessed the admission in 1652 of a Bulkeley of Beaumaris, and a Wynn of Denbigh, in 1651 of an esquire's son named John Lewis, a knight's son from Dublin called Richard Barry, a gentleman's son named Morgan Herbert[6] (probably the squire of Hafod Uchtryd who was High Sheriff of Cardiganshire from 1657 to 1660).[7] Before this had come in John Powell described, in making a supplication for his B.A. "grace" on 29 March, 1653, as "armigeri filius";[8] and shortly afterwards arrived William Glynne, eldest son of Lord Chief Justice John Glynne, who is referred in the Register of Congregation as an "esq."[9] and in Convocation Register T as "Principall Commoner" (in recording a dispensation granted him for attending certain public lectures for the degree of B.A., he having suddenly to leave the University[10]). What family during the Civil War had twisted and turned more

[1] *Ib.*, f. 188ᵛ.

[2] *Reg. Convocn.* T, pp. 283-284 — "was called to yᵉ charge of a publicke Schoole in Wales where he hath approved himselfe very painfull and industrious in yᵉ education of youth". In another context it has been suggested that this school was that of Cowbridge (*Religious Developments in Wales* (1923), p. 68).

[3] Foster: *Alumni Oxon.*, iii, 1206.

[4] Hardy: *Jesus College*, p. 16.

[5] *Life and Times*, i, 301.

[6] *Clark's Yearly Lists* (s. a. 1652), sections vi and viii.

[7] J. R. Phillips: *A List of Sheriffs of Cardiganshire*, p. 19.

[8] *Reg. Congregn. QA*, f. 104ᵛ.

[9] *Ib.*, f. 110, sub 20 March, 1655-56.

[10] pp. 275-276, sub 5 March, 1655-1656; adm. B.A. on 25th (*Reg. Congregn.* QA, f. 203ᵛ).

than the Bulkeleys?[1] Was it not in the troop of one of them that the Principal was accused of having enlisted in 1648? Who had transfused the arts of the trimmer with the subtleties of the law to such good effect as John Glynne?[2] Assuredly their sons and relatives could not find a more fitting spiritual home than the Jesus of Dr. Michael Roberts. Ex-Principals and ex-Archbishops received a cordial welcome there (if not from Roberts, then from the Anglican submitters); but did the loyal walls of the Welsh College shelter at this time, under the name of "la Cloche," a King's grandson, the Prince of Wales' eldest natural son? A person of that name, a servitor, is indeed found in the Buttery Books about 1647-1648;[3] but unfortunately for such a romantic hope, the exigencies of time compel the poor servitor to be most probably an obscure Jerseyman, and not the James de la Cloche whose existence was unearthed by Lord Acton about 1866, and who could only be about four years old in 1648.[4] Of the sons of clergymen who were driven out of the College in 1648 some account has already been given; sons of clergymen, and those not a few, came into the College during Visitation days, probably because those clergymen knew the Principal better than the London Committee of Regulation and as well (though from another angle) as Jonathan Roberts did. Dr. Hugh Williams, who had lost a Llandinam comportion and two rectories in Anglesey through the agency of Puritan committees,[5] sent his son William to Jesus in 1650,[6] the same William who afterwards became Speaker of the Commons in the reign of

[1] As proof of their temporary adhesion to the Parliament, see letters signed "Bulkeley" from *Bewmarice*, dated 7 Jan., 1646-1647, and addressed to Col. Mytton and Robt. Coytmore respectively (*Tanner MS.* 59, ff. 642, 643).

[2] It was an incautious remark by Anthony Wood (*Athenae* (1692), ii, 221-222) aspersing the memory of the elder Clarendon—alleging him (inter alia) to have received money at the Restoration from John Glynne—that led to the temporary expulsion of the antiquary from his beloved University at the instance of Clarendon's son (*Life and Times*, iv, 1-50).

[3] *Clark's Yearly Lists*, s.a. 1647, section x.

[4] For a summary of Lord Acton's account, see John Pollock: *The Popish Plot* (1903), pp. 25-27.

[5] *H.P.M.*, 51, 115, 137.

[6] J. C. Morrice: *Wales in the Seventeenth Century*, pp. 334-335. It is there said he became Scholar in 1652. It is curious that Clark makes no mention of him in section II of his *Lists* for that year. A "John Williams" does figure there.

Charles II and Solicitor General in that of James II. His father was one of the boldest and most uncompromising Anglican divines in the whole of Wales; he could be under no delusion as to the Principal's Puritan stories; rather would the ejected rector of Llanrhuddlad be very conversant with the inner confidences of the suddenly promoted hermit of Llanedwen.[1] The fact remains, and it is a very significant one, that the former sent his son to be trained under the latter. Again, prominent men whose sympathies with the Puritan cause were visibly weakening did not lose faith in the so-called Puritan institution at Jesus: was not Edmund Meyrick of Ucheldre who entered in 1656, one of the College's greatest benefactors in later times, very closely related to that Edmund Meyrick, also of Ucheldre in Merioneth, who was for some unspecified lapse imprisoned by Major-General Berry in 1655-1656,[2] and who lived to be a member of the Convention in 1660?[3] And Sir Thomas Myddelton of Chirk, friend and patron of Samuel Jones, though he had sent his son Thomas to Oriel, is yet in 1653 paying 10/- to "Edward ap Jo^{n} ap Harry his sonne of Garthyr at his goeinge to Oxford"[4]—to Jesus, with most probability, although the incompleteness of the matriculation entries in Book W makes it impossible to test the hypothesis. The fact that Sir John Aubrey of Llantrithyd, Royalist of Royalists, did not send his sons to Jesus about 1649-1650 is not matter for surprise: some homage had to be paid to his friend and kinsman the deposed Principal; but there is more body behind his decision that "by reason of the disturbances of those times [he] would not have his sonne of *any* college."[5] Sir John's other kinsman—the Wiltshire naturalist John Aubrey, friend and informant of Anthony Wood—though apostrophising the interregnum as "that darke time,"[6] saw well to draw up a will

[1] To be precise, Williams was not ejected from Llanrhuddlad and Llantrisant before 1650.

[2] *Rawlinson MS.* A. 34. 901 (fourth col.).

[3] W. R. Williams: *Parly. Hist. Wales*, p. 117.

[4] *Chirk Castle Accounts* (1605-1666), comp. W. M. Myddelton (1908), p. 44. In a note at the foot of this page (n. 152) the editor solemnly says his name cannot be found in the *Alumni*. If the learned Foster had no clue better than "Edward ap Jo^{n} &c", then surely he can be well excused.

[5] John Aubrey: *Brief Lives* (ed. Clark, 1898), ii, 7.

[6] *Ibid.*, ii, 141.

between 1650 and 1654,[1] which provided that his Greek copy of the works of Chrysostom and two tomes of Bede's should be given to the library of Jesus College.[2] That will never became operative, but it proved that Jesus was not quite "darke" enough to be completely ostracised even by a Trinity man, as John Aubrey was. Dr. Michael Roberts did not enjoy the respect of his own Fellows is very true; on the other hand, it is abundantly clear he was very well trusted by men in the country, especially if they were ejected Anglican clergymen or Laodicean Puritans. Did he receive in equal measure the trust and confidence of those well-affected "trustees" who were appointed by Parliament in 1647 to receive and distribute sums of money subscribed towards the maintenance of hopeful students at both the Universities "for the speedy supply of the Church of God in England with godly and able Ministers"?[3] No conclusive answer can be given, as no record of their activities has survived. A rash categorical negative would forget the almost uncanny dexterity with which Roberts threw dust into the eyes of Parliamentary committees.

Note: Henry Maurice.

This was the literary curate of Llannordineio who supplied marginal notes for the use of North Wales readers to Stephen Hughes' edition of Vicar Prichard's work published in 1659 and who, after a particularly puzzling attitude at the Restoration, developed into one of the most powerful Puritan forces in Wales during the Indulgence in 1672-1675, ultimately settling down as pastor of the "gathered church" at Llanigon in Brecknock (Calamy: Acct. (1713), ii, 567-572). The Nonconformist historian distinctly says he was educated at Oxford, a statement echoed both in the *Drych yr Amseroedd* of Robert Jones, Rhoslan (1898 ed., p. 24), and in *Enwogion y Ffydd* (Dos. II, 456); and *Matric. Book* II,

[1] *Ibid.*, i, 39, 52 (where probable date of will is discussed by Clark.)
[2] *Ibid.*, i, 52 (and n. 17)—"and all the rest of my bookes that are fitt for a library".
[3] For a copy (a printed broadside) of this subscription-scheme, see *Bodleian Wood Collection*, 276 A, No. 305.

f. 458^{v} does vouch that a "Henricus Morrice" was admitted to Jesus about July, 1651. Another Henry Morrice was admitted to St. John's in June of the following year (*ib.*, f. 205), an obscure person not associated with any other college than St. John's; while still another, son of Thomas Maurice of Llangristiolus, who became one of the most prominent Anglican divines of his generation, did not matriculate till 1664. This seems to build up a strong argument that the Lleyn Maurice was one of the two refractory alumni of Jesus who had to bend the knee in so dramatic a fashion on the floor of Congregation in April, 1658. As has been said on page 84 above, one was named Madrinell, the other Maurice, the Christian name in each case suppressed in Register QA. It was Maurice who had refused to go to Bocardo when ordered to do so. But if such is to be equated with the Puritan Maurice, how is one to explain that a person so unsatisfactory to the Puritan authorities at Oxford on April 1 is on June 24 of the same year approved by Puritan Triers to be curate of Llannordineio (*Lambeth* MS. 995, f. 229) and feels such a wonderfully changed man by November 30 as to denounce the presumption and empty vanity of readers who might utilise the old Vicar's rhymes to feed light hearts and fool-headed wantonness? (*At y Darlleydd*, last page of 1659 ed.). That sudden metamorphosis notwithstanding, it is significant that Maurice did in later years feel poignant regret at the irresponsible ways of his old life, though Oxford is not mentioned (Dr. Rees: *Hist. Prot. Noncon.*, 1883, pp. 214-215, quoting from the Puritan's diary); and that a Bishop of Bangor made great play with reminiscences of the Lleyn man's early career to neutralise his growing influence as a dissenter from the Church of England (*ib.*, p. 209). But it is too early as yet to say dogmatically that the Oxford and Lleyn equation works out satisfactorily at all points; for though it is well-known that the Lleyn Maurice was the youngest son of Griffith Maurice of Methlan, the bald entry in Book W gives no lead on the subject about the Oxford Maurice. "Plebei filius" is its only bit of information. The term "plebs" would sit very strangely on the shoulders of a gentleman deemed good enough to marry a daughter of John Wynn of Boduan (J. E. Griffith: *Pedigrees*, 271), did we not know that in the Oxford

registers it is very often used to connote persons of very substantial property (for a case in point, see Mr. Shankland's *John Myles*, p. 9).

(x) Dr. Michael Roberts v. Sir Leoline Jenkins and Others.

This last chapter is an apparent digression rather than a real one. Its contents, even to the inventory of the money found in his lodgings after his death, are absolutely essential in order to round off the character of Roberts and to study from a new perspective that adroit and stubborn daring which all but succeeded in defeating the Fellows of the interregnum. His later career of 22 years, counting from his deposition in 1657, was in the main one long effort to re-open the controversies associated with his name before and after 1648, or to counter before high authorities in Oxford and London the energetic efforts of his Restoration opponents to make of those years a closed book (they, paradoxically enough, hoped to gain this end by displaying his old activities at full length). This chapter will also enable us to watch the fortunes after the Restoration of some of the Fellows who once pitted will and wit against those of their Principal's. One eminent Scholar comes into the story. As regards the ex-Principal, the subject matter in general will be reverse of pleasant, seeing that he developed into an avaricious old bachelor and one of the most persistent and pernicious litigants that haunted the Vice-Chancellor's court. We shall discover, too, that in the decrepitude of old age, when success as a litigant was finally denied him, he endeavoured to storm his way within the patronage defences of two of the strongest Archbishops who ever sat in the chair of St. Augustine.

It is not very clear how long Roberts continued at Jesus to embarrass the new Puritan Principal before moving out to private lodgings in the city; it must have been at the latter that he heard of the surprising indulgence shown to his old opponents at the reconstruction of the College in 1660. Thomas Ellis and Hamlet Puleston and Laurence Jones were retained in their Fellowships; Thomas Ellis became Vice-Principal, and the former Vice-Principal, James Vaughan, was restored to the Fellowship he

had lost in 1656.[1] Rumour would before long bring to his ears the institution of Lewis Williams to a good living in Anglesey[2] and expatiate on the shrewd gymnastic by which Jenkin Lloyd became transformed from a Puritan commissioner into an Anglican pluralist[3]—two ancient enemies these also. Nor would the success of friends be much more palatable to the discarded Anglico-Puritan: Benjamin Parry made Fellow of Corpus and Greek Reader there;[4] his brother John retained Fellow of Jesus in 1660, confirmed in his Flintshire rectory, and made Canon of York in 1662;[5] and William Lloyd (probably a friend of his, certainly with Anglesey connections) re-instated in that Fellowship which he lost by refusing to face the Visitors in 1648.[6] And Thomas Morgan, whether friend or no, succeeded at Llandaff to the prebend once held by Philip Flower.[7] No private papers have survived to record his impressions when he heard of the obscure death of Hamlet Puleston in 1662 and of the double disappointment of Thomas Ellis in being passed over for the Principalship when Mansell finally retired in 1661 and on being forestalled in his historical researches by a fellow antiquary.[8] But when one thinks of him turning over in his mind the dispossession of Jonathan Roberts from the living of Llanfair in Dyffryn Clwyd,[9] the ejection of Samuel Jones from that vicarage of Llangynwyd which had once given an exile's home to Michael himself, and the proud front offered by the old Bursar to the arguments of archdeacons and the importunities of bishops[10]—then his innermost thoughts are more easy to conjecture. In

[1] Hardy: *Jesus College*, pp. 123, 129-130.

[2] Rhoscolyn (*First Fruits Certifs.*, Bangor, File 1, Sched. 20 Apr., 1660-20 Apr., 1661). Admitted 22 Nov., 1660.

[3] In the early months of 1660 he was commissioner for assessments in Cardigan and Carmarthen (Firth and Rait: *Acts and Ords.*, ii, 1382); on 25 June he was confirmed under the Great Seal to the rectory of Llangoedmor (*Pat. Rolls*, 12 Chas. II, Part i, No. 431). Other promotions soon followed.

[4] Hardy: *Jesus College*, p. 124.

[5] *Ib.*, pp. 124, 130; *Pat. Rolls*, 12 Chas. II, pt. i, No. 454, confirmed 11 June, 1660; *Alumni Oxon.*, iii, 1121.

[6] *Ib.*, p. 130.

[7] *Cymmrodor*, xxxi, 227.

[8] Hardy: *Jesus College*, pp. 123-124.

[9] Under Clause IV in 12 Chas. II, cap. 17—"An Act for the Confirming and Restoring of Ministers"; see also petition of the old vicar, Dr. David Lloyd, in *House of Lords' MSS.*

[10] Dr. Thomas Rees: *Hist. Prot. Noncon.* (1883), pp. 232-236.

the first case, he would moralise on the whirligig of time and its occasional revenges; to the mercenary soul of Roberts the second would seem sadly lacking in the rudiments of common sense.

As for himself, he had no desire to let the Restoration go by without turning its waters into his own mill. Regretting that he forgot to press his claims at the Jesus re-establishment in 1660, incensed at the worldly success of men not less opportunist than himself, and taking advantage of the common practice in 1660 for Fellows ejected from colleges in 1648 to demand payment of their Fellowship allowances for the intervening years,[1] Roberts in October of that year seems to have advanced a preposterous claim to the emoluments lost by him from 1638 to 1648 (as if the authorities would forget that he was a Principal put in and not a Fellow turned out). There is so very little in the Wynne MSS. at All Souls about the details of this litigation "in Causâ Computi,"[2] so much about the technical formalities surrounding procedure at the Vice-Chancellor's court, that the present writer would not like to be too sure he has stated the case with rigorous exactness; and the reference by Sir Leoline Jenkins' biographer to his hero's setting aside several illegal debts contracted by Dr. Roberts besides recovering several of the College revenues is too indefinite to hang any conclusions thereunto.[3] Whatever the precise content of the claim was, and it amounted to several hundreds of pounds, it was resisted to the utmost by the new Fellows and the two Restoration Principals, Francis Mansell and Leoline Jenkins. Great resolution was indeed necessary, since Roberts (inured to controversy during the notorious nine years of his Principalship) was master of all the re-entrant technicalities that governed the University court (more or less familiar to those who have read through the first 50 pages of Clark's fourth volume of the "Life and Times" of Wood[4]). It is not without interest that the Vice-Chancellor of 1662, Dr. Richard Bayly, invited Roberts to write Latin verses to celebrate the coming to England of Queen Catherine and professed to be so pleased with

[1] *Life and Times*, i, 323 (and n. 4).
[2] This description occurs in *MS.* 239, f. 670.
[3] William Wynne: *Life* (1724), i, Preface, p. ix.
[4] Henry, Earl of Clarendon v. Anthony à Wood.

them as to promise the ex-Principal preferment in the Church[1]—very probably to get rid of him somehow from Oxford. To peruse the surviving records of this case is a weariness of the flesh, extending as they do from 1660 to 1668, preserved partly in Latin and partly in English. Those whose legal minds delight in the distinction between a sentence interlocutory and a sentence definitive and a sentence absolutory, in delimiting the duties of Convocation and Convocation "delegates," in balancing the exact force of the parenthesis "si intra triduum . . . petierit et non aliter," in examining the formal procedure under the University writs "de introducendo et prosequendo appellationum," and not forgetting the statute "de cautionibus deponendis," might find digestive food in the All Souls MS. 239[2] and ultimately decide whether the case reached the deadlock "appellatio deserta" (as confidently claimed by the defendants and confidently opposed by the plaintiff). Even those whose minds are not so disposed, when they read how the Jesus authorities were forced to ask advice from some of the learned counsel who dwelt in Doctors' Commons[3] and to seek the interposition of the Dean of the Arches,[4] must be convinced that the single-handed Roberts was an academic barrator who knew the statutes by heart. More than that, he could at times strike home very hard: knowing that the then Principal was at once one of the fraternity of Doctors' Commons and himself deputy Dean of the Arches, he reminds the latter dignitary of a friendship too close for the exercise of impartial justice. "May it please you to inclin[e] him [Principal Jenkins] not to seek to crush a man of his Right by long Delayes but to come fairly to a trial of the merits of the Cause, [for] it will bee no greife of mind to you in time to come."[5] And if his case was

[1] *Tanner MS.* 314, f. 4.

[2] Especially ff. 592, 593, 593ᵛ, 594, 670, 670ᵛ.

[3] *All Souls MS.* 239, f. 615-615ᵛ (letter from Sir Giles Sweit under date 30 Jan., 1663-1664). At the end of a long opinion, and that not altogether encouraging, come the words: "how all the Acts stand I doe not know nor cannot informe my selfe for that the office here is shutt upon this day".

[4] According to a petition of Rice Wynne to Archbp. Sheldon in 1666 (Dolben Papers—*Bodl. MSS. Add.* C. 302, f. 114) and a remark in *All Souls MS.* 239, f. 637, Sir Giles Sweit was the Dean of the Arches.

[5] *All Souls MS.* 239, f. 592 (letter dated 4 Aug., 1668).

not progressing to his satisfaction the ex-Principal could (and did) refuse to pay the attorneys and advocates he had summoned to his aid[1] until the question was settled (there was another appeal to Doctors' Commons) whether a "proctor" who had earned his fees before the delegates of Congregation and Convocation could sue for them in the court of the Vice-Chancellor.[2] At the end of the Trinity Term of 1668 the case was still going merrily on, a proof of "appellatio deserta" on one day being followed on the next by a "defensio contra desertionem." Does not the following look like a Latin translation from "Bleak House": "tandiu protracta res erat, ut primi Delegati (uno excepto) abierint omnes, aut diem suum obierint"?[3] And that entry was made three years before 1668. Both sides were evidently bent on observing the advice which learned counsel gave to one of them, "soe run the course of Appeale, till you find that justice you desire."[4]

Professional advocates apart, the adjective "single-handed" has been applied to Dr. Roberts. But it is difficult to believe he had no secret friends somewhere in the University, men who were not friendly to the Leoline administration at Jesus or sportsmen who were ready to second an old disputant disporting himself in the academic ring. Whether between 1661 and the end of 1665 the doubly disappointed Thomas Ellis forgot his ancient enmity and sought the company of his sometime Principal must be left to the imagination; it is known that Ellis lived a life of great privacy at Oxford[5] until the sun shone on him once more when the King, Court, and Parliament came to that city in 1665-1666 on account of the plague raging in London. He was in January of the latter year presented under the Great Seal to the rectory of Dolgelley (vacant by the death of Dr. John Ellis), his patent being dated from "Oxford."[6] If Ellis had been busy, so had

[1] *Ib., ib.* Roberts refers in this letter to Sir William Turner's "Defence against a Desertion". Turner was one of the greatest lawyers of the Restoration; whether he was definitely "retained" by the ex-Principal is not very clear.

[2] *All Souls MS.* 239, f. 637 (letter from Sir Giles Sweit, dated 21 Oct., 1663). [3] *Ib.*, f. 593. [4] *Ib.*, f. 615.

[5] He was, however, one of the University Lent preachers appointed to officiate on Easter Tuesday, 1662 (*Tanner MS.* 338, f. 114).

[6] *Pat. Rolls*, 17 Chas. II, Pt. 3, No. 25, dated 15 Jan., 1665-1666.

Roberts. Securing an interview with Archbishop Sheldon in October, 1665, and availing himself to the utmost of the promises made him three years before by the then Vice-Chancellor of "something fallen to be in his Ma^ties gift,"[1] he made a desperate effort to get one of the vacant comportions of Llandinam, only to see it conferred upon Dr. Henry Compton, the later Bishop of London.[2] Thomas Ellis had hardly departed from Oxford when another Adullamite appeared on the scene in the person of Charles Edwards to publish at Oxford in that year his "Hanes y Ffydd." At what point exactly the old Scholar of Jesus and his former Head met is doubtful; but all who have read Edwards' second edition of his amplified work (the "Hanes y Ffydd Ddiffuant" first brought out in 1671) know that it contains a Latin commendation from Dr. Michael Roberts. Certain words in that testimonial —"non sine fructu relegisse me memini"—sound very much as if Roberts was one of the first to get a copy of the 1671 edition; the fact that it was written at all (seeing that it did not in the slightest degree excuse Charles Edwards from securing for the work the imprimatur of the Pro-Vice-Chancellor of the University and of the Bishop of London according to the demands of the Licensing Acts[3]) hints at a well-assured friendship between the two men. It would have added a new curiosity to literature if Roberts had lived to write a preface to the other's "*afflicted man's testimony concerning his troubles.*"

Other words in that testimonial must justify a further digression from the unfruitful story of appeals. They were to the effect that the ex-Principal—a man who had once obtained mercy to be faithful to the Puritan cause and had even been made a Visitors' delegate to see that republican oaths were taken without prevarication—could not see anything in the "Hanes" derogatory to the doctrine and discipline of the Church of England! Thus did he clear of heresy, as from a pontiff's chair, a story of the uncorrupted faith. Nearly four years before that, at the end of 1672, he showed in a letter to the Bishop of Bangor

[1] *Tanner MS.* 314, f. 50 (see also *supra*, p. 95, n. 1).

[2] Admitted 6 July, 1666 (*First Fruits Certifs.*, Bangor, File 2, Schedule 20 Apr., 1665-20 Apr., 1667). Of course, he had been presented under the Great Seal some months before.

[3] The testimonial was penned on 24 July, 1676, and the official sanction on 1 August.

how eloquently silent he could be. He did condescend to refer to the new Welsh translation of the New Testament brought out in that year by the ejected minister Stephen Hughes. Not a word has Dr. Michael to say of that beneficent Puritan editor. He simply grumbles out his regret that the Book of Common Prayer had not been attached to it.[1] The diligent forger of appeals had no desire to prejudice their chances by naming the name of a dissenter. Not even the Bishop of Oxford himself kept further away from the conventicle of "Tom Pun,"[2] licenced in the city under the Declaration of Indulgence.[2]

It is high time to return to the law-courts. By the year 1671 the last appeal in the apparently interminable allowance case must have been heard and adjudicated on, although the present writer has not happened to see that final decision. For Roberts, however, the end of one case meant the beginning of another: if the allowances from 1638 to 1648 were not allowed him, why not (especially since a good word from a new Vice-Chancellor as to his fitness for Church preferment[3] did not bring better fruit than the promises of the old one) make a bold challenge to be actually re-instated in the Fellowship lost in 1638? This was the very course adopted by him in 1672-1673;[4] and the last days of Sir Leoline Jenkins[5] as Principal of Jesus were engaged with the Fellows in preventing Roberts from once more climbing into the sacred fold. But surely the latter had effectively vacated whatever claims he had to the Fellowship when he became Principal ten years later? This is Principal Hardy's view;[6] it was also the contention of the Leoline Fellows as expressed in the All Souls MS. 239, f. 579; but in another and parallel statement of their case they confuse the issue by saying that the Earl of Pembroke in 1648 could as

[1] *Panton Papers*, O. III. 16.

[2] *Life and Times*, ii, 244. This is Anthony Wood's euphonious nickname for the learned Thomas Gilbert, who did not lose his reputation as a story-teller in becoming the leader of Oxford Nonconformists.

[3] *Tanner MS.* 314, f. 4, contains a copy of a testimonial from Dr. Peter Mews, Vice-Chancellor, dated 14 July, 1672.

[4] The implication of ff. 579-580 in *All Souls MS.* 239 is that this new crusade was opened in 1668. Else how can the words "thirty yeares after amotion in 1638" be explained?

[5] He was knighted at the beginning of 1670.

[6] *Jesus College*, pp. 138-139.

easily have restored Roberts to the Fellowship he had lost as wrongfully put him into the Headship.[1] It was not Pembroke who did put him into the Headship, but the Committee of Regulators: even the Visitors, men who utilised the statute "de diminuendo" in 1652 and connived at the "de amovendo" in 1657, would not do anything so foreign to University practice as to make a Principal concurrently Fellow of his own college; the cumulative effect of the Fellows' logic would have been to make Roberts at once Principal, Vice-Principal, Bursar, and Fellow. The real point of the Fellows' argument was that Pembroke was so fully convinced of the just "amotion" of Roberts in 1638 that not even in the auspicious circumstances of 1648 would he have him restored to it.[2] But if their case had to rest on this particular paragraph alone, replete as it is with half-truths and full-blooded inexactitudes, the result would have been a foregone conclusion. It has the one merit of showing to what lengths the present Leoline administrators of Jesus, embittered by a ten years' litigation with the same man, were willing to go.[3] Fortunately for them, the paragraph just referred to was the one indefensible piece of logic in a defence "pro Collegio" well-marshalled and compactly argued. Battle was waged all along the line. The ex-Principal's whole career at Jesus was laid under review, with appropriate emphasis on its many vagaries; these new Fellows recounted the full story of 1637-1638, the interview at Woodstock, and the edict of the Visitor;[4] they quoted verbatim the oaths sworn by the plaintiff when first admitted Fellow, pointing out how utterly irreconcileable with them his present claim was; and as to an extract from the College Register (circa 1637-1638) produced by Roberts to buttress his attack, they vigorously rejoined that the original had been lost and (by implica-

[1] *All Souls MS.* 240, f. 510.

[2] It is well to remember that it was the same Earl of Pembroke who was Visitor of Jesus in 1638 and Chancellor of the University in 1648.

[3] I do not profess to understand the Fellows' charge against R. that he "doth at this day implead the present society as haveing been Princip[ll] of the College for the Salary accruing to the Princip[ll] in those yeares" (*All Souls MS.* 239, f. 579). Had R. forgotten the statutory £40 p.a. paid him as Head *plus* the £92 p.a. augmentation given by the London Regulators? It is difficult to believe that this charge was seriously meant.

[4] *Supra*, p. 22.

tion) coolly laid that loss and the corruption of the present copy at his door.[1] True enough he was turned out in 1657, they add, but not for his loyalty to Church and King—exactly similar words used a few years before by Bishop George Griffith of St. Asaph in undermining the petition of an incorrigible rogue who was rector of Castell Caereinion and had been a sufferer under the Welsh Propagation Act.[2] Dr. Michael Roberts was not exactly a reprobate of the type of Rice Wynne; but, notwithstanding appeals to the Lord Keeper, to the Court of King's Bench[3] and a hearing before "referees" appointed "ad hoc" by the King himself, his claim was bound to fail; for all that, it involved the College in great trouble and considerable expense.

As if this second anti-Leoline litigation was not sufficient to dissipate his energies, Roberts was pleasantly engaged in suing an unnamed gentleman (in all probability, from Anglesey) "upon a Bond so ancient that the very length of time carried with it a presumptional evidence of Satisfaction," with the result that Lord Keeper Heneage Finch refused to allow him "the privilege of the University" upon a subpœna issued from Chancery during the Michaelmas term of 1673.[4] The plaintiff, however, *was* a privileged person of the University, whatever might be said against him; and how it must have delighted his soul to find the august University authorities so jealous of their privileges as to feel compelled to protest in a very vigorous manner against the injustice done them in general and Roberts in particular by not compelling that country gentleman to state his defence before the court of the University.[5]

This indirect blessing of the University rulers was but a poor recompense to Roberts for the failure of his two

[1] For a full account of the defendants' case, *All Souls MS.* 239, ff. 579, 579ᵛ, 580, must be collated with *MS.* 240, ff. 510-511.

[2] *Bodl. MS. Add.* C. 304ᵇ (Dolben Papers), f. 31 (letter to Archbishop Sheldon dated 25 June, 1666).

[3] "I cam up a week before the Term [he must mean before the University Michaelmas term ended] in pursuance of the sute in his Maᵗᶦᵉˢ Court of Kᴮ Bench for a Restitution to my fellowship in the Coll. of £20 per annum" (*Panton Papers*, O. III. 16—letter of 10 Dec., 1672 to Bishop Robert Morgan).

[4] *All Souls MS.* 239, f. 609.

[5] *All Souls MS.* 239, ff. 609, 610, 610ᵛ (cogently and humorously put).

onslaughts on the society of Jesus. There were still left for him the solace of Charles Edwards[1] and the remote possibility of Church preferment. To this latter end the ex-Principal, even before the Fellowship question was finally decided against him, had applied himself with tireless energy. These were the penultimate efforts of an old man in a hurry, efforts described in the letters he wrote to Sancroft either when Dean of St. Paul's or when Archbishop of Canterbury. In the summer of 1673 "at Dr. Assheton's request" he was called to preach before the Duchess of Ormonde; an unnamed Earl also spoke well of him to the King, "saying he had suffered for his loyalty"; and the King in turn went so far as to give him a promissory grant of vacancies in his gift, even ordering the same to be entered in the Signet Office under date 3 July, 1673.[2] One bishopric, that of Bangor, held by his old friend and neighbour Dr. Robert Morgan of Llanddyfnan, fell vacant within a month; but Archbishop Sheldon had already designed it three months before for the Dean of St. Asaph (Dr. Humphrey Lloyd).[3] Llandaff likewise wanted to be filled in 1675, Roberts' friends being just one day late in exercising their good offices;[4] it might be added that in 1674 the Llandinam comportion again fell to the lot, not of Roberts, but of a second English Philistine bearing the name of John Spaderman.[5] In 1676 the ex-Principal heard a rumour that Dr. Isaac Barrow of St. Asaph was ill and unable to see any one—as the King had promised that promotion to Dr. George Stradling, what was Roberts to do, he himself tells Sancroft, but hope for one of the Bishop's "commendams."[6] Barrow had the good fortune to live on until 1680, just

[1] Inference from *Life and Times*, ii, 262, sub April, 1673—"Mr Thomas Ellis, rector of Dolgelly, died in this month, as Mr Edwards tells me". In a footnote Clark says this Edwards was probably one of the graduates of that name at Jesus. He is much more likely to have been Charles, between whom and Wood there was considerable consanguinity of mind (although probably each of them would be loath to admit it).

[2] *Tanner MS.* 314, f. 48 (Roberts reviews his search for preferment in a letter to Sancroft, dated 2 July, 1678). The "3 June" on this folio is corrected to "3 July" on f. 50 (another letter to S. on 11 July, 1678). [3] *Ib.*, ff. 26, 50. [4] *Ib.*, f. 48.

[5] *Pat. Rolls*, 26 Chas. II, Part 9, No. 3, presented 18 Dec., 1674. Compton had to surrender this comportion on his appointment as Bishop of Oxford. [6] *Tanner MS.* 314, ff. 5, 6.

a year more than the ex-Principal.[1] In this context of St. Asaph and evidenced on folio 6 of the same MS., it comes out that Roberts had secured such a good correspondent in keeping him posted as to the health of the Bishop—the William Williams collated to the vicarage of St. George's by Abergele a few years before[2]—that he not only bestowed upon him the Signet Office "stet" which embodied the King's promise of 1673, but also made him "overseer" of his will, enriching him to the amount of £10 "to bee payd in 3 yeares by equal portion[s] at the feast of St. Michael the Arch-Angell." The "stet," however, never stood the grasping old man in any good stead; as the years went by, one Archbishop (Sheldon) being followed by another (Sancroft), the ex-Principal climbed down from bishoprics to prebends, varied by an appeal for a fellowship at "Eaton" or for the rectory of Queenhope (held by each of the Parrys in succession[3]) or last of all for the reversion of Llandrinio—"I would like not to be forestalled again."[4] But forestalled he was every time. He could not live down the nine years' anarchy of the interregnum at Jesus, nor the two ill-starred combats with its second Restoration Principal (the Sir Leoline Jenkins who was now entrusted with important embassies and soon to be a Secretary of State). And the continual pin-pricking of the high authorities must have made his name among them a byword and a reproach. Over and over in his letters does he dwell on the comparative money values of benefices likely to be vacant; his main point in his last missive to Archbishop Sancroft is that he hears Llandrinio is better than Llanestyn[5] (a remark he had made at least once before[6]). In a letter written in 1678 he expatiates in a supremely tactless manner to the Archbishop on the troubles he had had with his Anglesey rents, "som[e] of my own kindred

[1] Dr. George Stradling was also disappointed. Dr. William Lloyd, the old Fellow of Jesus and Dean of Bangor, began in this year his historic episcopate at St. Asaph.

[2] *First Fruits Certifs.*, St. Asaph, File 16, Sched. 20 Apr.-20 Oct. 1672. Collated 21 Sept., 1672. For a reference by Bishop W^m^ Lloyd to this same clergyman, see *Tanner MS.* 35, f. 119^v^.

[3] *Tanner MS.* 314, ff. 4-50, passim.

[4] *Ib.*, f. 25 (letter to Sancroft, dated 25 Feb., 1678-1679).

[5] Llanestyn = Queenhope or Hope.

[6] *Tanner MS.* 314, cp. ff. 5, 25.

scrued themselves to bee my Tenants," adding that he abhorred going to law with anybody[1] (Oxford Vice-Chancellors and London Lord Keepers could correct him on this point); in a letter dated 15 May, 1676, he assures the same dignitary he never begged a pulpit nor accepted money [for preaching?] when it was offered him, both statements being flatly contradicted by what the Tanner MSS. and other sober history have to say of him; nor, he said, could he spare a penny towards the rebuilding of St. Paul's, a remark effectively disproved by the revelations of the next paragraph.[2] It is true that 27 years before he solemnly assured the London Committee for the Advance of Money he used to preach constantly for nothing in Anglesey parishes during the period between his exodus from Llangynwyd and his coming to Jesus in 1648.[3] But was there a single man conversant with his history after the Restoration who would not laugh loudly at such a statement? Or any one who knew him before?

At the end of April, 1679, merciful death removed from Sancroft's path a wearisome correspondent (that prelate was then sorely beset with the multifarious problems of the Popish Plot) and from Oxford an eccentric old man —he could not possibly have been much less than 80 years of age[4]—who had outlived his age and whatever degree of usefulness an indulgent biographer might put up for assessment. The last stroke on the "Larum-Bell" had sounded.[5] Thus doth Anthony Wood chronicle his obscure end: "Saturday, Dr. Michael Roberts, D.D. [*sic*], sometime Principal of Jesus college, died with a girdle loyned with broad gold about him (£100 they say) at Tom Apleby's house against Logick lane, buried in St. Peter's church yard."[6] The inventory of his goods, taken by the "beedle of Lawe" on 2 June, found no less than £359 5s. 10d. in the form of gold and silver ready money, all his effects amounting to £391 19s. 10d.[7] Was the £100 mentioned by Wood included in this total? Lurking be-

[1] *Tanner MS.* 314, f. 48. [2] *Ib.*, 40, f. 1. [3] *Supra*, p. 25.

[4] In 1676 he had lived 60 years since his matriculation (in 1616). See *Tanner MS.* 40, f. 1.

[5] See his own quaint remark in *All Souls MS.* 239, f. 592.

[6] Life of Anthony à Wood (pub. by *Eccl. Hist. Soc.* in 1848), p. 214, sub 1 May, 1679. The statement of Principal Hardy (*Jes. Coll.*, p. 139) that he died on 3 May does not seem to agree very well with this entry of Wood's.

[7] See Appendix B.

hind this question lies one infinitely more difficult : is it possible to establish an effective connection between the £400 odd found in his rooms and the alleged manipulation of College rents and allowances in the days of his Principalship? The biographer of Sir Leoline Jenkins, writing in 1724, describes the character of Roberts (though not in any way referring to this ready money) as "infamous" and "corrupt."[1] The first adjective shows an utter lack of discrimination and has a fine flavour of quasi-Restoration invective ; as to the second, dogmatic assertion is not proof, and the last man to give an uncoloured judgement on the litigating Roberts was the panegyrist of Sir Leoline Jenkins. Let the ex-Principal be treated fairly. Was it not possible for a confirmed miser and bachelor who received (if only sporadically) rents from Anglesey tenants, and who as late as 1676 was doing some undescribed work for the University authorities[2] for which he would take some care to be paid—was it not possible for him to come honestly by his odd £400? On the other hand, Roberts must have been the possessor of a tolerably good fortune if the expenses of his numerous lawsuits after the Restoration left him with £400. Moving back a decade from William Wynne's "Life" we come to the "Sufferings" of Dr. John Walker which refers to Michael's name but twice,[3] to the Fellows' charges not at all, and that for the double reason that its author never actually saw the Visitors' Register[4] and that the transcripts from it sent him by a Fellow of Exeter were practically confined to the ejections of 1648.[5] If Walker became suddenly dumb about Hamlet Puleston because the latter gave in his submission,[6] would he not have waxed

[1] Wm. Wynne: *Life*, i, Preface, p. vii.

[2] "yet they do not spare to work me still" (*Tanner MS.* 40, f. 1—letter to Sancroft. 15 May, 1676). Two months later he was writing the testimonial to "Hanes y Ffydd Ddiffuant" (*supra*, p. 97). This makes one wonder whether his "work" was the reading of Welsh books on behalf of the Oxford censor: if this is ever brought to proof it will somewhat diminish the argument for close friendship with Charles Edwards.

[3] i, 143, col. i; ii, 120, col. 1.

[4] *Sufferings*, i, 138, and marginal note.

[5] The lists copied for him can be seen in *MS. J. Walker*, C. 8, esp. ff. 204-218, at the Bodleian. The Jesus transcripts were not done very efficiently, *e.g.*, *John* Flower instead of Philip, *Quarels* for Quarrell, *Meyock* for Meyrick, *Parrs* for Parry (*Suffs.*, ii, 120-121).

[6] *Supra*, p. 59.

eloquent over the infamous maladministration of a so-called Puritan Principal? Very evidently he had not heard of it. Fierce as was the massed attack of 1656, the Visitors upheld Roberts against the Fellows; mordant as were the reminiscences of their Restoration successors, they concentrated their arguments more upon the years before 1648 than upon the nine years that followed. John Aubrey was a strict contemporary, and certainly no friend to Roberts. His published works contain no reference to the ex-Principal's infamy; his private MSS. were utilised by Wood; and Wood is silent. Most significant of all, this silence of Wood's. As far as his many volumes of papers and diaries go, the obscure death in 1679 and the curious collocation of the £100 alone seem to have interested him. And yet that antiquary, who knew his Oxford so thoroughly and was such a wonderful repository of both gossip and fact, actually received permission from Sir Leoline Jenkins on 17 August, 1668, to peruse "certain evidences and a book of ingrossments" belonging to the College,[1] and on 19 April, 1671, was in the library seeking for one of the Sir John Price MSS.;[2] he was there again in July, 1689.[3] Is it likely that during these visits his comprehensive eye would fail to find incriminating evidence against the intruded Principal if it were there? If so, would he have hesitated to use it? It might be objected that Roberts helped Wood with information about Welsh authors to be inserted in the "Athenae";[4] but this kindness assuredly would not have saved his reputation, as the Merton antiquary was not only one of the most ungracious of men, but also notoriously ungrateful to those who proffered him assistance. So we have on one side the dogmatic diatribe of a supremely hostile witness balanced by the silence of a man whose nature and profession would have made him speak had he heard or seen anything worth speaking of. Avaricious Roberts was, and an impossible sort of person, but that he was dishonest is not proven. So this second effort, occasioned by the discovery at the Archives of the bedell's inventory, has been as little successful as the first[5] in getting at the

[1] *Tanner MS.* 338, f. 174[r].
[2] *Life and Times*, ii, 221.
[3] *Ib.*, iii, 307.
[4] J. C. Morrice: *Wales in the Seventeenth Century*, pp. 153-154.
[5] *Supra*, pp. 62-64.

real truth of the charges levelled against the Principal in 1655-1656. In fact, the absence of the Bursary Books is an insuperable barrier to progress in this quest.

In addition to the inventory, the Archives contain his will, drawn up on 4 April, 1678. It is pleasant to record that one of the three who witnessed it was Thomas Williams, a B.A. of Jesus,[1] and that one of the two who affixed their names to the documents of administration was a "clericus" named Edward Price, most probably a Jesus graduate of 1652[2] who was now rector of Llanrhuddlad in Anglesey;[3] it is equally pleasant to bear testimony that the then Master of Balliol very kindly allowed Elin Roberts of Llwydarth Escob in Anglesey the use of his lodgings whenever she was cited to Oxford as administratix of her deceased brother's property. Last of all, though he died at Tom Apleby's house against Logic Lane, his will describes him as still "dwelling in the University of Oxford"; and we have seen that his goods were inventoried by the University bedell of Law. Justly discarded by Jesus College, he must have been to the end a "privileged person" of the University;[4] though his transient homage to Puritanism must have become an unpleasant memory, the ex-Principal enjoyed to the bitter last (fully sanctioned by his Leoline detractors, by Anthony Wood, and by the bedell of 1679) that Doctorate in Divinity bestowed upon him in 1649 by a Puritan House of Congregation.

[1] It is to be hoped that the question of years is sufficient to dissociate him from the Oxford Thomas Williams—mimic, buffoon, sponger, and debaucher of youth—mentioned by Wood sub 26 July, 1652 (*Life and Times*, i, 175-176).

[2] *Reg. Congregn. QA*, f. 201 (admitted B.A., April 10).

[3] Admitted 8 Oct., 1670. (*First Fruits Certifs.*, Bangor, File 3, Schedule 20 Apr.-20 Oct., 1670).

[4] Since his deposition, he says in 1672, he had been "at studie *within the Universitie*" (*Panton Papers*—Appendix C). *Tanner MS.* 314, f. 50, has it that he used to attend all meetings of Convocation.

Appendices.

(A) *The Will of Dr. Michael Roberts* [from the University Archives].

1678. April 4.

In the name of God : Amen. I Michael Roberts Doctor of Divinity dwelling in the University of Oxford do make this my last Will & Testament, as followeth, on the fourth Day of April in the year of our Lord One Thousand, six hundred seventee & eight. First, I heerby revoke all my other Wills, which have been made by mee at sundry times formerly. Next, my mournful soul I humbly resigne into the hands of the blessed Son of God, Jesus Christ, who redeemed it, and hath had mercy on mee : Then, my Body to bee buried with Christian burial at the disposal of freinds, where it shal please the Lord to put an end to the days of my Pilgrimage. Of my goods & Chattels I give & bequeath to Thomas Davies, M^r^ of Arts & Rector of [ ][1] in the County of Carn-arvan three pounds : unto old M^ris^ Ipsley at the back of the round-Court in Strand, London, five pounds :[2] To the poor of the parish of St. Peter of the bayly in Oxford three pounds, to the poor of St. Peters in the East three pounds, to the poor of St. Thomas Parish forty shillings : to the poor of St. Michaels parish forty shillings : all the sayd summs to bee payd within six moneths after my decease : And the monies for the poor, to bee put into theyr own hands, lest Church-Wardens might bee tempted thereby, to lessen theyr allowance from the Parish. Item I give & bequeath to the poor of the parish of Llan Edwin[3] in Anglesey where I was born & baptised three pounds : to the poor of Llan-Twygarn[4] where my father was born, three pounds : to the poor of the several parishes wherin I have preached, the summs specified in a Schedul annexed to this my last will.[5] Item I give & bequeath unto William Whytchurch dwelling in great Horwood in

[1] See *supra*, p. 60 (and n. 1).

[2] It is "from my Lodgeing nigh the Six Bells at the back of the round Court in Strand" that the letter of 1672 was sent (Appendix C).

[3] Llanedwen.

[4] Llandrygarn.

[5] Unfortuately, these schedules are not attached.

the County of Buck : ten pounds. To his Brother John Whytchurch eight pounds. To another brother Marmaduke Whytechurch ten pounds. To theyr mother dwelling in Whaddon five pounds. To William, eldest son to the foresayd William Whytechurch ten pounds. To John the yonger son ten pounds. Item I give to Robert Norman & his wife Avis Whytchurch ten pounds. To theyr two little girles Francis & Ann five pounds to Each of them.[1] Item I give and bequeath to my servitor John Roberts of St. Mary Hall in Oxford forty pounds : to bee payd by 3 equal portions, that is to say twenty marks at every feast of St. Michael the Arch-Angel. And wheras thirtee years are past since in the great Sessions holden at Beau-maris for the County of Anglisey, I did levy a fine & passed a recovery on all my lands in Anglisey therby to cut off all estates of Reversion or Reversions, and legally to enable myself to dispose of the same, as I should see Cause : for that regard I do give & bequeath all my lands in Llwydiard Escob and my moiety of Penyrorsedd in the County of Anglisey unto my Neece Mary Bolton,[2] being my sisters yongest Daughter. Also I name and appoint my sayd Niece Mary Bolton executrix of this my last Will and Testament. Item I appoint Mr. William Williams Rector of St. George to bee the Overseer of this my Will and I give him ten pounds to bee payd in 3 years by equal portion, at the feast of St. Michael the Arch-Angell : that he may see this my Will duly Performed.

MICHAEL ROBERTS.

Signed in the presence of these Witnesses,

Henry Hopkins, Apothecary in Oxford.
Thomas Williams Batch : of Arts in Jesus Coll :
John Roberts Student in St. Mary-Hall Oxon.

Endorsement : 1678. April 4. Testamentum Michaelis Roberts.

[1] The present writer is not able to throw any light whatsoever on the Doctor's benefactions to this family.

[2] It is worth recollecting that one of the Fellows of Jesus turned out in 1643 was named Humphrey *Boulton* (*supra*, p. 14; *Clark's Yearly Lists*, s.a. 1647). He was son to Richard Boulton of Beaumaris, pleb., matriculated on 19 May, 1637, graduated M.A. in 1643, and was made Fellow the following year (*Liber Matric.* PP, f. 242).

(B) *An Inventary of the Goods and Chattles of Michaell Robertes late Dr of Divinity in the Vniversity of Oxon deceased taken and Appraysed June the 2d 1679 by Us whose names are Underwritten.*

[from the University Archives.]

		£	s.	d.
Imprimis	Two Habitts, two Hoods, and a Gown scarlet	5	0	0
Item	His other wearing Apparell ...	5	0	0
Item	Seven Trunks, two old Chests, four Hampers, two Bowes, and a Quiver of Arrowes, A close stoole and Pan, two lether Chayres, found small Boxes with other Lumber	2	0	0
Item	Linnen: Two payre of sheets, Eight Napkins, two table cloths, Two Pillowbeers, two Towells and three Shirts	1	0	0
Item	His Books	17	0	0
Item	In Ready Money gold and silver	299	5	10
It.	One Silver Wach, one spoone, one large Silver Medall	002	14	0
Item	More in Ready monys	60	0	0
	Sume	391	19	10

WILL: COLIER beedle of Lawe
and
RIC: DAVIS Verger.

(C) *A Letter among the Panton Papers (O. III. 16).*

Some months after this paper was read at King's College an article (and a highly interesting one) appeared in the Journal of the Welsh Bibliographical Society for August, 1923 (pp. 302-313), based on a newly-discovered letter in the Panton Collection written by Dr. Michael Roberts from London to his old friend Dr. Robert Morgan, Bishop of Bangor (bearing the date 10 December, 1672). The writer of the article was Miss M. Foljambe Hall of the National Library, who gave the world the arresting information that Roberts had acted as corrector

for the press of the Myddelton Bible of 1630.[1] It is indeed typical of that gentleman to break this news in order to say that another Anglesey man had misappropriated his copy of that Bible; he now wants the Bishop to bring the offence within the orbit of the ecclesiastical courts (and have another merry lawsuit!). From the story in the text it looks as if Roberts had met his match in the widow of the supposed offender, a lady of Heneglwys who sent him the "stout and daring" answer to pursue whatever course he pleased. The present writer was curious to have a look at this epistle of the Doctor's; and remembering that the Panton Papers are just now in process of being catalogued, it was no small kindness on the part of Mr. Ballinger to let that curiosity be satisfied. The upshot has been the incorporation in this work (at the eleventh hour) of materials which reinforce its arguments at one or two important points. In particular, this applies to the Philip Jones reference on p. 76 and to the strictures on the New Testament translation of 1672 noticed on pp. 97-98. Considerations of space prevented Miss Hall from quoting the letter in full. It remains to note the piquant coincidence of two people, almost concurrently and quite independently, being moved to take some interest in the career of a notorious Oxford don who was not famous enough to find a place in the Dictionary of National Biography.

[1] "I have heard that, when the last impression of the Bible in Welsh was made, at the charge for . . . part, of Sir Thomas Middleton and . . . Heylyn, aldermen of . . , Your Grace's predecessor of precious memorie, Archbishop Laud [ordered ?] those two aldermen to provide two Batchellors in Divinitie or . . . persons of Batchellor in Divinitie's standing for the correction . . . presse, and to allow them convenient recompence for their [lab]our & pains about it" (Dr. Humphrey Lloyd from Bangor, 10 Aug., 1676, to Archbishop Sheldon, advocating a very close watch over Thomas Gouge's project of bringing out a new Welsh translation of the Bible—*Tanner MS.* 40, f. 18[v]). If Roberts was one of these correctors, who was the other?

[*Acknowledgments.* The preparation of this paper would have been impossible but for the invariable courtesy and readiness

(i) in Dublin, of the Assistant Librarian of Trinity College;

(ii) in London, of the authorities at the British Museum, the Public Record Office, Lambeth Palace Library, Sion College, and the Library of Dr. Williams at Gordon Square;

(iii) in Oxford, of the Keeper of the Archives, Bodley's Librarian, the Sub-Librarian of All Souls, the Bursar and Librarian of Jesus College;

(iv) in Wales, of the National Librarian and Mr. Ifano Jones, of the Cardiff Free Library.

The author also owes his best thanks to the following gentlemen for various items of information: to Col. J. A. Bradney (Philip Flower), to Dr. John Edward Lloyd (batellers and postmasters), to Mr. T. U. Sadleir of Lansdowne Road, Dublin (career of Dr. Michael Roberts at Trinity), to Mr. Gilbert Williams of Rhostryfan (pedigree of the Carnarvonshire Glynnes). Especially has he to thank Principal Hardy for giving him a copy of his volume on Jesus College published in 1899. And a word of gratitude is due to those Librarians and others who have made valiant efforts to come across "Hanes Plwyf Bodedern" (reputed to contain some references to the Anglesey Head of Jesus) but have so far been unsuccessful. Principal J. H. Davies took great trouble in the quest.]

CORRIGENDA.

P. 72 (n. 3), *for* "line" *read* "lines".

P. 82 (n. 2), *for* "dissenters" *read* "Anabaptists".

INDEX.

(n. = footnote.)

Aberffraw, 78
Abergele, 11, 16
Act (Comitia) of 1651, The, 53-54
Adams, Constantine, 6, 15, 17, 38
All Hallows (Oxford), 83
Andrews, St. (Glam.), 3
Apleby, Tom, 103
Assheton (or Ashton), Dr., 101
Aubrey, Sir John, 41, 89
Aubrey, John, 3, 89-90, 105

Barrow, Dr. Isaac, 101-102
Barry, Richard, 87
Barton, 79.
Bassett, Theodoret, 14, 17
Bayly, Dr. Richard, 94
Beaumaris, 88 (n. 1), 108
Beckford, James, 82 (n. 2)
Berry, Maj.-Gen. James, 77, 89
Bible, The (Welsh edition of 1630), 110
Bodedern, 26
Bolton, Mary, 108
Boulton, Humphrey, 14, 108 (n. 2)
Bowen, James, 80
Braine, Nicholas, 83
Brecon, 80
Brent, Sir Nathaniel, 7, 8
  Roger, 7-8
Brevint, Daniel, 15-16, 18
Brice, Edmund. 32, 33
Brown, ——, 32
Brynllywarch, the academy of, 35
Bulkeley, Col., 24, 88
Bynner, William, 80

Canon, Maurice, 46
  Sir Thomas, 46
Cantabrigians, 33, 81, 86
Castell Caereinion, 100
Cefnllys, 19
Channel Islands Fellowships, 16, 64
Chepstow, 14
Christopher, Jenkin, 78, 79
Colier, William, 109
Commissioners under the Propagation Act (1650-1653), 8 (n. 6), 17
Committee for the Advance of Money, 23-27, 30, 103
  Plundered Ministers, 16
  Regulation of the Universities, 5-6, 10, 14, 17, 19, 46, 48, 51, 56, 88, 99
Compton, Dr. Henry, 97, 101 (n. 5)
Conant, Dr. John, 11, 29, 56, 61, 69, 72
Cosheston, 80
Cox, William, 32
Cowbridge School, 79, 87 (n. 2)
Coytmore, Lewis, 64
Crew, Nathaniel, 81 (n. 2)

Davies, Henry, 85
  Morgan, 80
  Thomas, 59-60, 78, 85, 107
Davis, Richard, 109
'de amovendo', 65, 73, 99
'de diminuendo', 55, 99
de la Cloche, James, 88.
Delegates of Convocation to examine University expenses, 60
Delegates of Convocation to examine University statutes, 53
Delegates of the Visitors, 6, 53
Delegates 'pro negotiis publicis', 46, 53, 57
Devynnock, 18
Dodwell, Henry, 31
Dove, Francis, 86
  Thomas, 87
Drinkwater, William, 64

'Drych yr Amseroedd', 90
'Drych Cristianogawl', 19.
du Creetz, Henry, 37
du Moulin, Dr. Lewis, 63
Duppa, Dr. Bryan, 22

'Edward ap Jo^{n} ap Harry his sonne', 89
Edwards, Charles: refusal to submit to the Visitors discussed, 11-12; submits afterwards and is elected Scholar of Jesus, 33-34; returns to preach in Wales, 44; promoted to rectory of Llanrhaiadr and loses it, 75; secures testimonial of Dr. Michael Roberts for 'Hanes y Ffydd', 97; probably referred to by Wood in 1673, 101; another reference to him, 104 (n. 2)
Eglwysael, 64
Eglwysbach, 80
Ellis, Dr. John, 3, 15, 77
Dr. Thomas: refuses to submit to Visitors, 15; later surrender, 17; appointed Censor, 57, and sub-delegate of Convocation, 60; joins in charges against the Principal, 65; retained Fellow at the Restoration and becomes Vice-Principal, 92; a double disappointment, 93; becomes rector of Dolgelley, 96: reference to his death, 101 (n. 1)
Engagement, The, 11, 83
Erbery, William, 5, 32
Eure, Henry, 32, 33, 41, 42, 47
Evans, George, 14, 18 (and n. 5)
John, 9, 37

Fagans, St., 3
Fell, Dr. Samuel, 22
Finch, Lord Keeper Heneage, 100
Flower, Philip, 13-14, 18, 20, 104 (n. 5)
Forward, John, 32, 33, 42 (n. 4)
Foulkes, John, 80
William, 80
Frewen, Dr. Accepted, 4

Garnett, Edmund, 47
Gelligaer, 19
"Gemma Cambri", 62
George's, St., 102
Gibbon, Whitgift, 15
Glynne, Chief Justice John, 81 (n. 1), 88 (n. 2)
Col. Thomas, 26
William, 80-81, 87
Goddard, Dr. Jonathan, 29
Goodwin, Dr. Thomas, 29, 56, 61, 72, 84
Grandison, Lady, 47
Greenwood, Dr. Daniel, 69
Griffith, Alexander, 29-30, 77
Francis, 80
Dr. George, 100

Harrison, Maj.-Gen. Thomas, 10
Heneglwys, 110
Henry, Philip, 8, 9, 31, 35, 37, 59
Herbert of Chirbury, Lord, 40
Herbert, Morgan, 87
Heylin, Dr. Peter, 21
Hill, Richard, 7
Hitchcock, George, 84, 86
Holt, 78
Holyhead, the impropriate rectory of, 40, 63, 64
Hood, Dr. Paul, 86
Hopkins, Henry, 108
Howell, Dr. Francis, 73, 75, 84
Hughes, Herbert, 80
John, 13-14, 20, 84
Stephen, 90, 98

Ipsley, Mrs., 107

Jenkins, Sir Leoline, 16, 20 (n. 4), 64, 80, 94, 95, 98, 102, 105
Jesus College developments (1642-1660), noteworthy aspects of; exceptional loyalty to the King's party, 2-4; unique incidents at the Visitation, 13, 38, 84; recurring turbulence over elections to Headship, 58, 74-75, 86; tragic vicissitudes of the Robertian tenure, 23-76; highly artificial Puritanism, 78-84

Jones, David, 85
Capt. Jenkin, 4
Col. John, 23
Laurence: elected Fellow, 36, and Bursar, 60; subscribes charges against Principal, 65; appointed delegate "pro negotiis", respondent in the School of Theology, and Vice-Principal, 68; retained as Fellow in 1660, 74-75, 92
Col Philip, 76
Richard, 62, 78
Samuel (Llangynwyd): non-submission to Visitors, 8, 9; submits later and becomes Scholar of Jesus, 33-35; elected Fellow, 56, and Bursar, 66; some evidences of partiality for the Principal, 71; departs for Taunton, 72, and Llangynwyd, 73; reference to his tutorial work, 78; ejected from Llangynwyd in 1662, 93
Thomas (3), 36
"Judgement of the University, The", 5, 15.

Kelsey, Lieut.-Col. Thomas, 6
Kemeys, Sir Nicholas, 24

la Cloche, 88
Lad Lane messuages, 64
Langley, Dr. Henry, 81
Lewis, Col. James, 55
John, 77
Robert, 25, 26
Llanblethian, 78
Llanbrynmair, 17, 80
Llandinam comportion, 88, 97, 101
Llandogo, 19
Llandrinio, 102
Llandrygarn, 21, 28, 107
Llandyfodwg, 19
Llanedwen, 21, 28, 89, 107
Llanestyn (Queenhope), 78-79, 102
Llanfair D.C., 74, 93
Llanfair-yn-Neubwll, 25
Llanfechell, 45
Llanfetherin, 17
Llanfyllin, 80
Llangattock-juxta-Usk, 14
Llangoedmor, 93 (n. 3)
Llangynhafal, 51
Llangynwyd, 22-23, 71, 73
Llanhamlach, 80
Llanigon, 90
Llannordineio, 91
Llanrhaiadr-ym-Mochnant, 75
Llanrhuddlad, 89 (n. 1), 106
Llantrisant (Angl.), 78, 89
(Glam.), 79
Llantrithyd, 4 (n. 4), 41
Llanycil, 78
Lloyd, Charles. 83-84
David, 79 (and n. 7)
Dr. Hugh, 3
Dr. Humphrey, 3, 8, 51 (and n. 2), 101
Dr. Jenkin: elected Fellow, 36-37; collects Maenclochog rent, 46; secures the revived Bursarship, 50; receives the Llangynhafal group of revenue, 51; acts as commissioner for assessments in South Wales, 74; sometime "approver" under the Propagation Act, 50, 78; becomes an Anglican pluralist after the Restoration, 93
Dr. Oliver, 8, 10 (and n. 2)
Dr. Richard, 51
Col. Thomas, 55
Thomas, 83-84
Dr. William, 16, 17-18, 31, 85, 93, 102 (n. 1)
Llwydiarth, 45
Llwydiarth Escob, 106, 108
Lucy, Dr. William, 21 (n. 5), 80

Madrinell, Mr., 91
Maenclochog, 46
Mainwaring, Dr. Roger, 9
Mansell, Dr. Francis: his advanced Royalism, 4; dispossessed of the Principalship in 1648, 19; keeping rooms well into 1649, 37; presents accounts and departs, 40-41; detains

College rents in 1651-1652, 55; is allowed to return to the College, 58; his alleged 'direction' to the Fellows after the deposition of Roberts, 74; gives evidence before the King's Commissioners in 1660, 75-76; vigorously opposes the new claims of Dr. Roberts, 94
Margam, 21 (n. 1), 23
Mary's, St. (Oxford), 53, 81-82
Marychurch, St., 12, 78
Maurice, Griffith, 91
Dr. Henry, 91
Henry (of Lleyn), 90-92
Henry (St. John's), 91
Merthyr Dovan, 17
Mews, Dr. Peter, 98 (n. 3)
Meyrick, Edmund (i), 80, 89
Edmund (ii), 89
Peter, 14, 17, 104 (n. 5)
Mitre Inn, 18
Morgan, Dr. Robert, 27-28, 101, 109, 110
Thomas, 15, 17, 60-61, 93
Mostyn, Ambrose, 78
Myddelton, Sir Thomas, 8-9, 11, 89
Mytton, Col. Thomas, 23, 28

Nannerch, 51
Nicholls, Nicholas, 86

Oath, The Negative, 83
Oxford Colleges (1648-1660), the difficulties of,: All Souls, 73, 83, 84; Balliol, 55; Lincoln, 84; New, 42; University, 45-46, 55; Wadham, 55
'Oxonii Lachrymæ', 17
Oxwich, 80
Owen, Sir John, 28
Dr. John, 29, 54, 61, 62, 72, 77, 81

Parry, Dr. Benjamin, 44, 45, 66, 82, 93, 102
Dr. John, 44, 45, 56, 59, 78-79, 82, 93, 102
William, 14, 19, 104 (n. 5)
Penruddock rising, The, 62
Pembroke, The (fourth) Earl of, 6, 9, 20 (n. 4), 22 (n. 4), 98-99
The (fifth) Earl of, 61-62
Penegoes, 9
Penry, James, 14, 18-19, 80
Meredith, 80
Pierce, Edward, 78, 86, 87
Powell, John, 87
Vavasor, 3-4, 9, 30, 44, 77-78, 83
"Praelector Dialecticae", 67
Price, Edward, 86 (n. 4), 106
Price, Sir Herbert, 27
Owen William, 37, 87
Capt. Richard, 23
William, 14
Prichard, John, 78
Pugh, Henry, 16
Puleston, Hamlet, 9 (and n. 3); elected Fellow, 58-59; Presbyterian leanings, 59; subscribes charges against Principal, 65; appointed Praelector, 68; retained as Fellow in 1660, 74-75, 92; death, 93
Judge John, 58-59
Pypon, Nicholas, 37

Quakers at Oxford, 83-84
Quarrell, James, 14, 17, 104 (n. 5)
Queenhope (see Llanestyn)

Reynolds, Dr. Edward, 10
Rhoscolyn, 93 (n. 2)
Roberts, Elin, 106
John 23 (n. 3), 25, 26, 60, 108
Jonathan: elected Fellow and assists in charging new Principal with delinquency, 30-31; previous career at Cambridge, 33; accepts service under the Propagation Act, 44; becomes vicar of Llanfair D.C., 74; ejected in 1660, 93
Roberts, Dr. Michael: appointed Principal in 1648, 20; his academic history, 21-23; accused of delinquency, 23-24; answers

and acquittal, 24-27; charges examined, 27-29; alleged dissolution of the Society, 41-43; created D.D., 43; acts as Bursar, 47-48; receives augmentation of salary from the Trustees, 48-49; the Fellows level charges against him in 1650, 49; contest for the Bursarship, 50-51; Visitors' decisions on Fellows' complaints, 52; takes part in University administration, 53 - 54; his tactical triumph in 1654-1655, 60-62; a summary of the charges against him, 63, and an attempted inquiry into the problem of justification, 64-65; is petitioned against to the Protector and solemnly deposed by the Fellows in 1656, 65; prolonged sessions of the Visitors to discuss action of the Fellows and re-examine the whole question, 65-68; the Principal acquitted and receives marks of favour from Trustees and Convocation, 69; further contest over accounts and final deposition, 71-74; a review of his Principalship, 76; reverberations of his rule at Jesus, 84-86; outline of activities after the Restoration, 92; litigation, 94-96, 98-100; ceaseless efforts for Church promotion, 96-97, 100-103; death, 103; reconsideration of old charges in light of his will, 103-106; copy of his last testament, 107-108, and of the bedell's inventory, 109; a lately-discovered letter written by him in 1672, 109-110
Roberts, Philip, 80
Roberts, Timothy, 79
Robin, 60 (n. 3)
Rowlands, Richard, 78
Ruabon, 8

Sancroft, Dr. William, 27, 101
Sanderson, Dr. Robert, 5, 10
Saumur, 16
Savage, Andrew, 15, 17
Dr. Henry, 7
Selden, John, 10
Seven Deadly Sins (lane), 83
Sheldon, Dr. Gilbert, 4, 7, 27, 101
South, Dr. Robert, 35
Spaderman, John, 101
Stradling, Dr. George, 101
Swansea Free School, 17
Sweit, Sir Giles, 95 (nn. 3, 4)

Talke, Arthur, 32
Taunton, 72
Taylor, Richard, 78
'terrae filius', 54
Thomas, Oliver, 23-24
Timothy, 37, 79
Dr. William, 78 (and n. 7)
William, 78
Tillyard's (coffee-house), 83
'Tom Pun', 98
Tracey, Sir Humphrey, 47
Treaty of Surrender, The (Oxford), 5
Treflesg, 25
Trustees for Maintenance of Ministers, 48
of 'godly' students at Universities, 90
Turner, Sir William, 96 (n. 1)

Ussher, Dr. James, 58

Vaughan, James: submits to Visitors, 15, 17; unspecified charges brought against him, 38; appointed Vice-Principal, 57; witnesses a College lease, 64; heads indictment of Principal, 65; loses the Vice-Principalship, 66-67; made Fellow in 1660, 92-93
Rowland, 3

Visitation, The Parliamentary: genesis, 4-6; procedure, 6-7; anomalies, 7-9; grades of self-interest, 9-11; the fortunes of Jesus men, 12-19; high standard of Visitors' appointments, 29-30; three Visiting panels, 56; important decisions on Jesus affairs, 49-50, 52, 55, 60-62, 65-69.

Wallis, Dr. John, 63
Walter, Henry, 3
Ward, Dr. Seth, 74, 75
White, William, 19
Whitehall, Robert, 7, 11
Whytchurch family, The, 107-108
Willcox, Francis, 32, 33, 41 (n. 6)
Wilkins, Dr. John, 29
Thomas, 12-13
William, 15, 19
Williams, Edward (H.S. of Brecknock), 77
Dr. Hugh, 88, 89
Lewis: refuses to submit to Visitors, 15; surrenders later, 17; absent from Oxford in 1648-1649, 42; appointed Bursar in place of Jenkin Lloyd, 57; bitter opponent of Principal, 65; promoted to a benefice in 1660, 93
Thomas, 106, 108
Sir William, 88-89
William, 102 (vicar), 108 (rector)
Wolvercote lecture, The, 48, 52, 82 (and n. 2)
Wood, Anthony, 3-4, 6-7, 11, 39, 74, 105
Woodstock, 22, 99
Wrexham Free School, 48
Wynn, John, 91
Wynne, Dr. John, 86
Dr. Owen, 16
Rice, 100

Ysceifiog, 51

Zouch, Dr. Richard, 5, 10